DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 654 UD 014 359

AUTHOR	Tolbert, Sandra, Ed.
TITLE	Resource Papers; Ford Training and Placement Program.
INSTITUTION	Chicago Board of Education, Ill.; Chicago Univ., Ill. Graduate School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Apr 70
NOTE	118p.; Second reprint, June 1971
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$5.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	College School Cooperation; Curriculum Development; Field Instruction; Foundation Programs; *Preservice Education; *Program Descriptions; Program Development; Role Perception; School Organization; Social Systems; Teacher Education; *Teacher Education Curriculum; Teacher Placement; *Urban Teaching
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this report is to record as accurately as possible the activities of the Ford Training and Placement Program for the training of educational personnel. The program accepted a theoretical construct based on the premise that a school is a social system. A four-point proposal was developed, featuring: (1) Focused preparation--personnel trained to identify and to respond to urban school problems. (2) Coordinated preparation--personnel communicating their own and others' problems and functions in an effort to develop understanding of their roles. (3) Cadre formation and placement--personnel establishing a group which would foster a working relationship in which problems could be solved. (4) Demonstration and induction school--a mechanism for disseminating methods, materials, and projects. The program adopted all four phases of this proposal. This report emphasizes the second and third areas, touching on all four aspects. These "Resource Papers" are divided into five sections: (1) the introduction; (2) the practicability of a theoretical model; (3) the quality and procedure of curriculum development; (4) the effect of the Ford Training and Placement Program on role function and role development; and, (5) the conclusion. More empirical documents will hopefully be available within the next year. (Author/JM)

ED 092654

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

The University of Chicago

and

The Chicago Board of Education

Resource Papers

FORD TRAINING AND PLACEMENT PROGRAM

April, 1970

VT 014359

5835 South Kimbark Avenue
Chicago, Illinois

ED 092654

FORD TRAINING AND PLACEMENT PROGRAM

Resource Papers

April, 1970

Henrietta Schwartz
Executive Director

Sandra Tolbert
Editor

Second Reprint
June, 1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface iv

The Introduction 1

"The Ford Training and Placement Program and the University of Chicago" by Roald F. Campbell 3

"The Ford Training and Placement Program and the Chicago Public Schools" by James F. Redmond and Curtis C. Melnick 7

The Practicability of a Theoretical Model 15

The Practicability of a Theoretical Model" by Henrietta Schwartz and Wayne Doyle 16

The Quality and Procedure of Curriculum Development 39

"Rationales for Understanding Teaching: A Ford Summer Program" by Robert Rippey 41

"The DuSable English Curriculum Committee" by Robert Parker 52

"A Mathematics Program" by Pamela Ames 57

The Effect of the Ford Training and Placement Program on Role Function and Role Development 61

"Problems of Communication and Cooperation Among School Staff Members: A Focus for an Interning Social Psychological Specialist" by Frederick F. Lighthall and Stephen Harkness . . . 63

"A Community Representative's View of the Cadre: An Interview" as told by Lester Bell to Sandra McClenney 69

"Personal Reflections of a Principal Participating in the Ford Program"
by Dorothy Berg 74

"The Public School as a Setting for Field Work Instruction in Social Work: A Coordinated Program with Teacher Training"
by Carol Thackham 85

"The Cadre Liaison/Curriculum Coordinator Role"
by Geraldine Brownlee 94

The Conclusion 99

"The Ford Training and Placement Philosophy as the Basis for an Alternative Program to Train Teachers at the Undergraduate Level"
by John Sawyer 102

PREFACE

It is difficult to assess the achievements of an experimental program during its early years. However, the Ford Training and Placement Program must find some method by which it may systematically review its activities in an effort to designate future action and to disseminate some of its present information. It is the purpose of this report to record as accurately as possible the activities of the Ford Training and Placement Program for the training of educational personnel.

The Ford Training and Placement Program accepted a theoretical construct developed by J. W. Getzels ["Education for the Inner City: A Practical Proposal by an Impractical Theorist," The School Review, Vol. 75, No. 3 (Autumn, 1967), pp. 283-99] which is based on the premise that a school is a social system. If the school is, indeed, a social system then specific ideas seem evident.

1. Roles in the social system function in complementary relationships
2. Mutual understanding of roles lends more efficient and effective personnel
3. Productive dialogue between educational trainers (the university), its users (the school), and its clients (the community) will yield properly functioning schools.

From the three observations cited by Getzels, he developed a four-point practical proposal.

1. Focused preparation--personnel trained to identify and to respond to urban school problems

2. Co-ordinated preparation--personnel communicating their own and others' problems and functions in an effort to develop understanding of the roles

3. Cadre formation and placement--personnel establishing a group which would foster a working relationship in which problems could be solved

4. Demonstration and induction school--a mechanism for disseminating methods, materials, and projects.

The Ford Training and Placement Program has adopted and is adapting all four phases of the proposal. This report will emphasize two of the areas: co-ordinated preparation and cadre formation; however, it will touch on all four aspects. The segments are so highly interrelated that it becomes difficult to delineate the parameters of any one facet.

The Ford Training and Placement Program's "Resource Papers" are divided into five major compartments:

1. The introduction
2. The practicability of a theoretical model
3. The quality and procedure of curriculum development
4. The effect of the Ford Training and Placement Program on role function and role development
5. The conclusion.

Finally, the Ford Training and Placement Program offers this report as its initial phase in establishing a more conclusive document for educational training. It is not the intent of these papers to be definitive but rather to be informative. The Ford program hopes to have more empirical documents within the next year.

THE INTRODUCTION

The Ford Training and Placement Program begins its "Resource Papers" with statements from the administrative heads of the collaborating institutions.

The effect of a practical project on a theory oriented university is documented succinctly by the Dean of the Graduate School of Education. He describes some of the means by which the Ford program and the University mesh in their joint attempt to bring theory and practice together.

In the second paper, the practical component of the Ford program, the Chicago Public Schools, is reviewed. The General Superintendent and the Associate Superintendent of Area A describe the effects of the project, its relationship to the school system, and the usefulness of a collaborative program between a university and a school system.

Roald F. Campbell: "The Ford Training and Placement Program and the University of Chicago"

Mr. Roald Campbell, Dean of the Graduate School of Education and Chairman of the Department of Education, has participated actively in the development of the Ford program. In his paper, he synthesizes the effect of a practical program on a university that emphasizes research and theory.

James F. Redmond: "The Ford Training and Placement Program and the Chicago Public Schools"

Mr. James Redmond, General Superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools, has promoted the positive relationship between the University and the Board of Education. In his collaborative paper, he addresses the positive elements of the project.

Curtis C. Melnick: "The Ford Training and Placement Program and the Chicago Public Schools"

Mr. Curtis Melnick, Associate Superintendent in charge of Area A, Chicago Public Schools, has cooperated fully with the Ford program. His expertise in the field of education has been extremely useful to the project.

THE FORD TRAINING AND PLACEMENT PROGRAM AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Roald F. Campbell

The Ford Training and Placement Program is a very deliberate effort to bring the Chicago Schools and the University of Chicago into a collaborative effort around the problems of teacher education. In a sense, the Ford program is designed to bridge two social systems. I shall consider in this short statement only those ways in which the program appears to have affected the University. While the program does bridge the campus and the field, it is housed at the University and many faculty members and other personnel have participated in the program. As with all social systems, change in one part tends to affect other parts of the system, in this case the University.

By way of purpose, the Ford program was established to permit the Graduate School of Education to pay more attention to the preparation of teachers for urban schools. It is one thing for academics to declare that they wish to do more in teacher education for the inner city; it is quite another thing to actually work at it as has been required in the Ford program. For instance, student support takes on a different dimension when students are to be selected, in part, because they have an interest in being placed in an urban school. In similar fashion, institutional support for faculty and supplementary personnel requires some reconsideration when such support is to be related, at least in some respects, to new training

tasks. In this connection the Graduate School of Education has found it desirable to reach beyond its own membership to include faculty members and other personnel in the School of Social Service Administration. Moreover, continuing working relationships with public school personnel have been required.

The Ford program has created some problems for the University. One of these problems is found in the addition of a number of new staff members. Established faculty and other personnel suddenly find that offices are occupied with new faces. In a building where space is limited and in a climate where "projects" are viewed with some skepticism, nerves have at times been worn a little thin and criticism has sometimes been uttered. Such discomfort has required continued interaction between the new and the established group.

A more substantial problem for some faculty members has been a required redirection of time and energy. One cannot spend hours in urban schools or weeks with neophyte teachers preparing to teach in those schools and continue to do all of the things he might have done had there been no Ford program. In an institution long noted for its inquiry and research, this relative change in emphasis can be somewhat upsetting. To be sure, some faculty members have found a way by which their research and training interests can be realized and been enhanced in the Ford program.

Another problem growing out of the Ford program is the additional organizational complexity it provides, particularly to the Graduate School of Education. Indeed, at times it appears that the Ford

program is actually a competing program with its own purpose, its own staff, its own budget, and its own student body. Frequently, faculty members raise questions about the structure of the Graduate School and how the several programs are related to each other and to the over-all purpose of the Graduate School. Somehow differentiated support, such as provided by Ford funds, is thought to imply differentiated purpose and program.

One more problem will be mentioned. The Ford program administered by the University has been able to respond to some requests from schools and cadres within those schools. This appears to give some teachers and principals the impression that the University has unlimited resources and that these resources can be used to fill the service needs of the schools. Obviously, University resources are limited, the resources available, even in the Ford project, are for specific purposes and the University cannot and should not become merely a service agency to schools.

While there have been problems, there also appear to be a number of encouraging accomplishments resulting from the Ford program. Clearly, faculty and students in teacher education have a much more realistic understanding of urban education, particularly as it is affected by such factors as poverty and race. Building upon such an understanding programs of teacher education for the inner city are being made more realistic than was once the case.

The Ford program has tended to advance knowledge in the field of teacher education. The programs for teachers developed to cope

with the realities of the inner city must be evaluated and many specific problems related to these programs need to be researched. Thus, a number of new areas of inquiry have been provided. Mr. Doyle and his colleagues have been pursuing a number of these leads. A few of the reports and papers prepared thus far are: "Chronology of the Ford Training and Placement Program," "DuSable Cadre History," and "A Study of Classroom Reinforcement Techniques."

Another consequence of the Ford program is the encouragement of increased flexibility in training programs. For prospective teachers who wish to focus their training on the inner city there is now a vehicle by which they may do so. For other students who wish to do a more typical MAT program the way is still open. Actually, the Ford program has been one stimulus in the development of a MST degree in secondary education, a degree which permits somewhat less emphasis in a single academic discipline and some additional emphasis in education and such related areas as psychology and sociology.

Thus, the University as one of the partners in the Ford Training and Placement Program, particularly its Graduate School of Education, has undergone and is still undergoing some changes due to the Ford program. The purpose of teacher education preparation has been extended and a number of internal problems have been confronted. Moreover, certain achievements appear to be within reach. These include a sense of reality for the Chicago program for training urban teachers and the body of knowledge in teacher education, particularly for urban settings.

THE FORD TRAINING AND PLACEMENT PROGRAM AND THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

James F. Redmond

Curtis C. Melnick

The Chicago Public School system is pleased to be a significant part of the Ford Training and Placement Program, which is a joint venture with the University of Chicago.

For the past several years there has been evident a growing working partnership between the University and the Chicago School system which has been of benefit to both organizations. As a leading teacher-training institution in the country, the University has been in the forefront of postulating and testing theories for the improvement of the training of administrators and teachers. Always research-oriented, the University has of late become convinced of the wisdom to participate in action research. Of necessity this influenced the University to turn to the Chicago Public Schools as the laboratory for its creativity in this respect, since the University is totally located within Chicago's city limits. Its Department of Education is situated within easy walking distance of close to a dozen elementary schools and at least two large, complex high schools.

Thus, the Chicago Public Schools have benefited much from previously existing programs fostered by the University including the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) and Master of Science in Teaching (MST) programs. In addition there have been other examples of collaboration between the University and the Chicago Board of Education

including the nationally acclaimed Woodlawn Experimental Schools District Project in which an important third partner is the Woodlawn community itself. In response to very rapid social change impinging on education today, the schools as laboratories have benefited from the University's crucial testing of important changes in the training and attitudes of teachers and administrators.

The District Superintendent of District 14,[1] later to become the Area Associate Superintendent for the southern third of the city's districts, had been invited by the University to become an active consultant to the Ford Training and Placement Program from the time of its formulation and has served as a member of its Executive Committee since early 1967 before the actual program got under way.

With the approval of the General Superintendent of Schools, Dr. James F. Redmond, Dr. Curtis C. Melnick, Area Associate Superintendent, prepared the report for the agenda of the Chicago Board of Education at its meeting held on December 27, 1967. At this meeting the Board of Education formally gave its approval to the participation by the Chicago School system in the Ford Training and Placement Program.

The report noted that the University was awarded a substantial grant "for the purpose of training professional personnel for elementary and secondary schools of the inner city and to place teams of these professionals in several selected schools in Area A at both the elementary and secondary level, and that the purpose of this 'cross-role' training program is to develop within a team of educators, consisting of administrators, teachers, adult educators, and psychol-

ogists, a sense of shared responsibility for the entire program of the school through a collaborative program of training."

The report continued to state that "cross-role experiences for those selected to participate in the program will be two kinds: graduate study and practicum. The graduate study experiences will consist of seminars and research that will involve observation into the concentric settings of school, neighborhood, and city. Team members will study certain inner-city schools and the school communities. Cross-role members will also participate in a group practicum to provide them with a common basis of information and knowledge about the setting and the instructional needs of the school."

The report went on to indicate that "after qualifying for placement according to the requirements of the Chicago Public School system, teams will be placed as employees of the Chicago Public Schools in schools being opened for the first time or currently in operation. The placement of three such teams is expected to be effected in September 1969, with additional groups of three teams expected to be placed in each of the following years, in September, 1970, September, 1971, and September, 1972. An executive committee to determine policy for the training program includes...a member of the Administrative Staff of the Chicago Public Schools."

Financial support for a portion of the program has come from the Chicago Board of Education in the form of salary payments to cadre members studying cross-role relationships during the summers of 1968 and 1969. It is expected that the same support will be afforded

during future summer operations of the program. The Chicago Board of Education has also partially financed the payment of salaries to members of all cadres during their internship year in the program.

The Chicago School system has been pleased to note that the former and present executive directors of the program have had long experience as teachers and/or administrators in inner-city Chicago Public Schools. This experience has done much to smooth relationships between the schools and the University in a complex and sometimes challenging relationship.

That former and present staff members have had experience in the Chicago Public Schools has also proved most helpful, especially since the positions have evolved as liaison officers between the Chicago system and the University.

It was unfortunate that the first elementary cadre, whose principal was carefully selected, oculd not become activated for the second or internship year. It had been hoped that this cadre would form the nucleus of the staff for a new elementary school to be ready for operation in September, 1969. Because of financial difficulties, the opening of this school has had to be postponed to September, 1971, a stark fact which led to the dissolution of the cadre. However, those of its members who elected to be placed in individual schools were accommodated. The principal, who had been on sabbatical leave, was given another administrative post of his own selection, for the 1969-1970 school year.

It was also unfortunate that more care was not devoted to the selection of members for one of the two high school cadres in 1969.

Many classroom failures on the part of two trainees led to the conclusion that they were not temperamentally suited for working with the existing administration and faculty in the school in which they had been placed. The members of the other high school cadre worked out well and continue to function in an admirable fashion.

It is worth mentioning that in these days of concern with community involvement and community participation the members of the Horace Mann Elementary School cadre during their present internship year are heavily involved in working with members of the community as full partners in seeking out solutions to problems of the school which community, PTA members, and faculty have identified as important.

The Ford Training and Placement Program has been operative for the past two years in four high schools and two elementary schools. All schools but Forrestville High School are in Area A.

These include, for the first year, DuSable and Kenwood High Schools and a temporary placement at the Lewis-Champlin Elementary School. During the second year of the program first-year internship placements were made to the Mann Elementary School and Forrestville and Hyde Park High Schools. It is expected that cadres will continue to be placed in Chicago Public Schools each successive year for the duration of the program.

In addition to the Area Associate Superintendent of Area A, three members of the administrative staff of the Chicago Public Schools have been invited to serve as members of the policy-making Executive Committee for the Ford Training and Placement Program.

They include the Area Associate Superintendent of Area B, and two District Superintendents of Area A, one of whom was formerly principal of DuSable High School when that school was the locale of a cadre for its internship year. As it has expanded its operations, the program has also expanded its horizons in its desire to become effective in a second large administrative area of the Chicago system, Area B. One of the two high school cadres for 1969-70 has been placed in Forrestville High School in that Area. In the Spring of 1971 it is hoped that this school will function in a new, modern facility, which is to be renamed the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. High School. It is also likely that one of the two placements of high school cadres for 1970-71 will be effected in Area B.

Although the Chicago Public School system comprises a vast bureaucracy which sometimes evidences a sense of resistance to change, it has "bent" and "accommodated" its procedures and policies for teacher certification to accomplish desired goals of the Ford Training and Placement Program. For example, there is no certification process for adult educators as such. Administrators of adult education programs have been regularly assigned principals of Chicago High or Elementary Schools. Teachers of specific subjects in the standard adult education program have been certified in accordance with the same procedures effective for teachers in the regular Kindergarten through Twelfth grade program. Yet, it has been possible to permit the adult educator for the Kenwood High School cadre to become the effective administrator for the adult education program during the second training year at that school, and she has inaugurated an effective program.

Thus, there has been a symbiotic relationship between the Chicago Public Schools and the University of Chicago in the carrying out of the objectives of the Ford Training and Placement Program. That this argues well for the future of education in the Chicago Public Schools is a merited conclusion. The system looks forward to increasingly more effective cooperation with one of the great universities of the world to the evident benefit of both.

Notes

1. The University of Chicago is located in District 14, one of twenty-seven geographical administrative areas in the City of Chicago.

THE PRACTICABILITY OF A THEORETICAL MODEL

As participants in an experimental program, we often lose sight of the practicability of the theoretical model. Surely the importance of the theory upon which a project is based is fundamental to its operation, but its relationship to reality--the school--is equally important. Ivory tower theories become real world activities only when the real world, the school, can see their usefulness--their failures and successes.

It is the responsibility of any program to openly declare its limitations. If it can eliminate specific problems then it is imperative that these ideas are stated. However, if it cannot cure certain ills then it is even more important to clarify these areas.

In the following document, the Executive Director and the Director of Research of the Ford Training and Placement Program summarize the development of the program and clarify the parameters in which the project can function.

Henrietta Schwartz: "The Practicability of a Theoretical Model"

Mrs. Henrietta Schwartz is responsible for the total programmatic and operational segments of the project. As an experienced public school teacher and Director of the program, it is imperative that she speak to the appropriateness of the Ford program through a summary of the project's history and suggestion for its future.

Wayne Doyle: "The Practicability of a Theoretical Model"

Mr. Wayne Doyle, Director of Research, collaborated with Mrs. Schwartz on this paper. His expertise in the field of research augments it.

THE PRACTICABILITY OF A THEORETICAL MODEL

Henrietta Schwartz and Wayne Doyle

The mention of theory and practice in the same paragraph often leads to the assumption of a false dichotomy. We have no wish to engage in that exercise in futility. We are concerned here with the usefulness of a model for teacher training and placement proposed by J. W. Getzels[1] as operationalized in the Ford Training and Placement Program. That last statement is presumptuous, for it implies that the creative ideas and concepts proposed by Mr. Getzels have been implemented fully.

Those of us who have been involved with the program recognize the responsibility entrusted to us. Creative ideas are rare and precious. All too often educators use them at an unseemly rate, cast them aside, and rush on to consume another idea. But truly creative ideas are fragile things needing time, patience, and, above all, tender loving care to survive. Those charged with the development of an idea into an experimental program constantly must clarify program goals. At the same time, they may also need to revise goals while the program is in process in order to achieve consonance with the reality of the situation. In a controlled laboratory situation, one can select and manipulate the environment and events surrounding the testing of a new concept. The central-city schools of Chicago do not permit this measure of control. At best, ideas are never more than an abstraction from reality. They must be tested in the world of phenomena and fact. Therefore, the

self-correction mechanisms built into the Ford Training and Placement Program have sometimes changed an original concept. These changes must be documented to insure that the program activities which are initiated can be traced from a contemporary conceptual framework.

This paper is an attempt to add to what should be a growing written culture, describing the growth and development of the cross-role cadre concept for the training and placement of professional school personnel. First, a brief overview of the two years of operation will be presented, followed by a description of some of the revisions instituted. Second, the plans for the evaluation of the program are discussed and, finally, a general assessment of what we have learned from the cadre experiences is given. The question of practicability cannot be answered by the Ford Training and Placement Program alone. The ultimate test of practicability rests with those school systems and teacher training institutions that see the model as useful and adapt it to their situations. Then, they too have the responsibility of letting others know which elements of the creative concept work, which do not, and, most important, how the concept was changed to meet the realities of public education.

The Ford Training and Placement Program, envisioned as a six-year project, is one component of the Urban Studies Program at the University of Chicago begun in January, 1968. The first six months were devoted largely to planning and preparation; hence, the program has been in full operation for about two years.

In the initial conception of the Ford Training and Placement Program, the school was seen as a social system. The effectiveness of universities' current methods of preparing teachers, counselors, and administrators for positions in inner-city schools, and the prevailing procedures for placing these personnel in inner-city schools were questioned. The practice of preparing teachers along grade lines or along subject-matter dimensions did not attend to the reality of the school as a social system composed of unique roles. The role of the inner-city teacher is not the same as the role of the suburban teacher, yet universities prepared teachers as if these roles were interchangeable. Further, the concept of the school as a social system suggested that roles in the school never functioned in isolation, but in complementary relationships to other roles. The work of the teacher was related to that of the counselor, and to that of the administrator, and all were related to the community milieu. Yet the universities prepared teachers, counselors, and administrators in separate curriculums though, once in a school, they functioned in interconnected roles. Again, the concept of the school as a social system suggested that the greater the mutual understanding and good will among the various educational personnel, the greater the effectiveness and efficiency of the school. Yet, once trained, educational personnel were placed individually rather than as groups with no opportunity to get to know each other before the first day of school. Finally, the conception of the school as a social system suggested that for the school to function properly there must be communication

among the trainer (the university), the user (the school), and the client (the community).

A program for more efficient preparation and placement of personnel for inner-city schools was projected. The program sought to reduce the isolation of beginning teachers in inner-city schools, and to increase communication among the school, the community, and the university. The Department and the Graduate School of Education of the University of Chicago obtained the cooperation of the Chicago Board of Education and presented the plan to the Ford Foundation. In January of 1968, the Ford Training and Placement Program was funded for three years. We have negotiated with the Ford Foundation for a three-year continuation of the grant through 1973.

The Ford Training and Placement Program has begun the development of a training program for the improved preparation of teachers and other professionals for urban schools. The program aims at reducing the isolation of teachers and other professional personnel in urban schools by increasing communication within the school and by providing group support for new teachers entering these schools. The notion of a cadre or team composed of new teachers, experienced teachers, administrators, psychologists, social workers, and special service personnel has been used to provide support and communication. Through the operation of the cadre, it was hoped that teachers and other professionals, both new and old, would benefit from an increased understanding of one another's roles, that problems central to the urban school would be identified and dealt with more effectively by

a group than by an isolated individual, and that this in turn would lead to improvement in the quality of teaching and learning in urban areas.

The Ford program is a complex one. Teachers and other personnel are to be trained in six different training programs of the University: programs designed to prepare teachers for secondary schools, teachers for elementary schools, psychological specialists, adult educators, school social workers, and school administrators. For most of these persons a three-year sequence is involved: an initial year of training, an internship year as a member of a cadre, and a year of bona fide employment in the Chicago schools. Three cadres are in their placement year and three are in the internship phase this year. Three new cadres are in the process of being organized for internship in 1970-71. The term cadre may be misleading, for it assumes that once interns are mixed with experienced school personnel there is instant understanding and mutual support. Our experience indicates that cadres must have time and care to mature in order to become the kind of group which can function effectively. We have no magic formulas for instant cadres, but we do know some procedures which can facilitate the efficient growth of an effective cadre. These factors will be enumerated at a later point in the paper.

First Year

From one perspective, the first year of the program was one of failure. Plans for the new elementary school plant, initially projected by the Chicago Board of Education for completion and

occupancy by the autumn of 1969, were deferred and it became clear as the year proceeded that the elementary school cadre had no suitable place to go. Hence, the cadre had to be dissolved and cadre members split up for their internship and placement years. In one of the secondary schools, collaboration between cadre members and school personnel did not develop as anticipated. In the end, two of the cadre members were not accepted for employment with their colleagues in that school for 1969-70. Thus, in terms of building unified cadres, in only one of the three cases was there marked success.

There was also some confusion of purpose. From the beginning, the program was designed to focus on the training of teachers and other personnel for urban schools. Despite this intent a number of the participants saw the program as a curriculum improvement project or, even more broadly, as a school system reform movement. To be sure, these purposes are not mutually exclusive, but the focus on training requires one set of procedures and allocation of resources, while school reform seems to require a somewhat different set of procedures and allocations.

In the staff there was considerable difference of opinion about certain practices. Some thought that the program should deal directly with the black communities; others thought that the communities should be approached only through the school. Some staff members placed great faith in the social sensitivity training of cadre members; others saw the cadres as task-oriented with a need for training focused chiefly on school tasks.

The entire project was affected by the rapid growth of black separatism. So strong had this movement become that several schools in the spring of 1969 responded negatively to the placement of a cadre, whereas all of these schools seemed to be receptive to such an idea in the spring of 1968. Race relations, responses of the Chicago Teachers Union, the Board of Education, and the stance of the federal government including the Department of Justice are not yet clear but they will affect this program.

These and related difficulties finally led to the resignation of the Executive Director and the employment of a new Executive Director, Mrs. Henrietta Schwartz. Despite these difficulties and failures, there was a renewed determination on the part of the staff, the Executive Committee, and related faculty members to learn from the experiences and make the program work.

From another perspective, we did experience some successes. In addition to the training and placement of teachers, an attempt has been made to evaluate the entire effort. A Research and Evaluation Committee, with the help of research assistants, has made a start in that direction. Its efforts have produced a number of documents. Reports include a description of the 1968 summer trainees and their reactions to the program, a summary of the reactions of parents and community participants to the 1968 summer program, a summary and interpretation of various statements of the goals of the project, and a survey of the perceived pressures of cadre participants. Additionally, there are papers available which summarize the responses of cadre members to questions about the functioning of cadres, and

a chronology of the Ford Training and Placement Program. Consistent with the self-correcting nature of the program, ways of improving evaluation were discovered and are being implemented in the second year of the program. Mr. Wayne Doyle became the full-time Director of Research and Evaluation in August of 1969. Mr. Doyle and his staff have designed and are operating a programmatic plan of evaluation designed to provide this project and others with the data necessary to analyze and redirect staff energies. The creation of a history of the operation of the concept is shared by the research and evaluation and dissemination and demonstration components of the Ford Training and Placement Program.

Second Year

The second summer training program covered six weeks, during the summer of 1969. In addition to providing training and orientation for the three new groups, two of the first-year cadres engaged in special projects.

This summer featured the introduction of a new staff role, one crucial to the success of the cadre: the cadre liaison person. This focal role serves as the necessary bridge between the Ford staff, the cadre, the administration, the University, and the community. During the first year, each cadre worked with a group process consultant in the role of sensitivity trainer. Analysis of the consultant's role indicated a change of relationship. The group process consultant now is used to facilitate communications in the groups as they work on tasks. The teams are viewed as

developmental work-oriented groups of individuals that are in the process of becoming cadres through a series of shared experiences. The group process consultant and the cadre liaison can help the group deal honestly with the problems and issues related to its interpersonal and professional relationships. Seemingly, this combination of staff members working with each cadre has allowed individuals to share common objectives, attitudes, and values as they work on tasks in the school and community.

As an overview, it was felt that the 1969 summer program was a successful one because it concentrated on the questions which most concerned the participants going back to the schools, as well as the questions of interns going to the schools for the first time. The most discouraging aspect of the summer program and the second year of operation was the late placement of one of the high school cadres. The administrator and the experienced teachers were not able to work with the University-based interns during the summer training period. The delay in the formation of the cadre presented misunderstandings and problems unique to this group.

It also became clear that the first-year cadres needed a placement-year program. The successful first-year high school cadre was contacted and resources provided to work out a program involving over 50 per cent of the total school faculty. But much time was lost because a placement-year program was not planned earlier. The first-year cadres felt deserted by the Ford staff and the University. The enthusiasm built during the internship

year was frustrated and dissipated without the support of the group and the resources of the University. To maximize the use of cadre time and energy, the staff is encouraging the second-year cadres to submit proposals for placement-year activities which may be an outgrowth of internship and summer projects. Modest funds are being set aside in the budget to support placement-year activities. The dialogue among the University, the school, and the community must be a continuous one. Eventually, each group develops its own resources. We see evidence of this in our successful first-year cadre and all of our second-year cadres, but the support of the staff and the University must be available when needed.

The in-service training sessions held during the internship year on a monthly basis are planned by a committee composed of representatives from each cadre and the Executive Director of the program. Initially, the monthly meetings were planned by staff. Participants expressed some dissatisfaction, and the more representative group, the Planning Committee, was established. This Planning Committee has arranged programs which have proved to be more meaningful to the total group. The topics covered include Research and Evaluation in an Experimental Program, The Role of the Administration as a Member of a Cadre, Identification of Issues of Concern to FTPP Cadres, The Socialization Process for Teachers, and Planning for Summer and Placement-Year Programs. Other issues to be considered are The Place of the White Teacher in the Black School, Teacher Competency, and The Cadre as a Training and Placement Mechanism.

Most of the cadres this year look promising, but we cannot say more until they complete their internship and placement years. We need more experience with the cadre model to make definitive statements. If we have learned anything it is that each school is a unique social system. Though there are commonalities, we must test a number of alternative cadre operations if we are to generalize. We do believe the cadre placement is a more efficient and effective model than single placement of interns. First, cadres institute and implement more department- and school-wide curriculum innovations. Second, new teachers (MAT's-MST's) placed in cadres tend to survive and remain in inner-city schools at a higher rate than do those placed individually in the traditional way.

Despite the frustrations of the first two years, there have been a number of achievements. For the most part, there have been excellent cooperative relationships with the Chicago schools. For instance, the Board of Education is in the process of establishing a new position for adult educators. This has required help from the Assistant Superintendent for Personnel, the Vice-Chairman of the Board of Examiners, and the Secretary of the Board of Examiners. Already established is a new position for social workers. This development required the assistance of the Area A Associate Superintendent, the Assistant Superintendent of Schools in Pupil Personnel Services and Special Education, the Director of Social Work in the Bureau of Pupil Personnel Services, and the Director of Pupil Personnel for Area A. The Ford Training and Placement Program has

supported the persons in these new positions during the internship year with supervision and financial aid. In addition to continuing these arrangements, the Board has agreed to support the new positions as full-time Board employees next year. The Board of Education has also accepted, on a trial basis, the role of psychological specialist which heretofore has been totally supported by the University. Two Area Associate Superintendents and two District Superintendents are members of the program's Executive Committee; three principals have been members of the program's Operating Committee.

The Chicago Board of Education has contributed financially by supporting ten teachers in the Ford Training and Placement summer program and by supporting six elementary interns during the academic year. The Board of Education was unable to finance Board personnel as initially anticipated, hence it has been necessary for the Ford Training and Placement Program to contribute to the support of Board personnel for summer and in-service training.

The Revised Plan

The first phase of the program's experience has been analyzed and evaluated by personnel representing all the components of the program--Board of Education administrative personnel, school principals, cadre members, University committees, and the executive staff, in addition to the Research and Evaluation Committee. The result has been the identification of seven major factors which are seemingly crucial in determining the relative success of a cadre. The seven factors are:

1. The attitudes of the experienced school staff toward the cadre,
2. The selection of cadre participants,
3. Specialist role training,
4. Pre-internship summer program,
5. Internship cadre training,
6. Internship specialist training, and
7. Responsiveness.

In each of these areas, programs have been modified to capitalize on achievements and minimize difficulties that were experienced during the program's first year of operation. Program personnel are convinced that some of the appropriate changes have been made. The revisions have been introduced and are in the process of being evaluated during the 1969-70 school year. Additional changes may be necessary. It should be remembered, also, that the testing of these modifications cannot be made until the cadres presently in training complete the program. The elements of trial and revision are implicit in the searching nature of the program.

Attitudes of experienced teachers toward the cadre. Some anxiety surrounds the prospect of incorporating the cadres into the on-going school structure. Steps have been taken to allay initial suspicion of cadre members, and to develop positive cooperation on the part of experienced teachers. The attitudes of experienced teachers will be influenced by the perceptions held of the cadre as it functions in the school during the internship year. Therefore,

the cadre training experiences have been modified to emphasize the need for planning group activities to include service to the larger faculty. In addition, experienced faculty will be involved in curriculum development for the summer program.

The key role of the administrative staff of the school has been recognized by requiring full-time participation of the principal or his designate as a member of the cadre with a special invitation to participate in classes and seminars in administration at the University. In addition, a University representative to serve in the role of cadre liaison has been established to facilitate relations among the experienced faculty, the cadre, and the University.

Selection of cadre participants.[2] Since available data indicate no major differences in the personality patterns of interns in the successful and less successful cadres, a more thorough collection of data in this area has been instituted. In addition, interns have been given the opportunity to visit prospective schools and, if they wish, to do some student teaching at the schools. A series of interviews with prospective interns by staff precedes the final selection of cadre membership. Staff teams conduct interviews with prospective experienced teachers and compare their selections with faculty nominations and the principal's selections before an invitation is issued to the school-based person.

Specialist role training. Each specialist training program has incorporated instructional segments dealing with urban education. Some have altered their specialist requirements to accommodate the

summer pre-internship Ford training program. For teachers in separate disciplines, for psychologists, for social workers, provisions have been made to adapt many aspects of the academic curriculum to deal with the special learning problems of the inner-city student. Experts in curriculum development from several University departments have made their services available to the cadre schools.

Pre-internship summer program. To create the spirit of cooperation basic to the program's aims, the summer program in 1968 brought together interns, experienced teachers, community representatives, and public school students to focus on two major problems: the development of group cohesiveness and cooperation in planning curriculum and teaching procedures. The problems encountered reflected the necessity for the cadre to know more about the target community, the inner-city school student, and the specific problems of the target school. Additionally, the cadre had to take the time to develop its own life style before it could respond to the community or the school.

Consequently, the pre-internship summer program for 1969 was revised to focus on knowledge of the cultural background and psychological characteristics of urban learners, knowledge of the unique problems of the target school, and explicit planning for in-school activities. As a result of feedback from participants, the 1970 pre-internship program is being planned with the participation of the school- and University-based members of the new cadres. More time will be allocated for cadre planning activities.

The study of the learner will use the interaction of University faculty and experienced teachers to create understandings that are both theoretically based and practically useful. It will include black history, black culture, and characteristics of the urban learner.

Generalized curriculum lectures and discussions will be replaced by subject-matter groupings and practicum trials of materials with students so that the study will lead directly to new materials and new skills needed in teaching.

The cadre group will be limited to professional personnel and, if identified, the community representative who will function as a cadre member. Each group will be given large blocks of time to begin the process of planning its future as a cadre at a specific school.

Internship cadre training. Internship cadre training has been devised to include on-the-job support, assistance in problem analysis, and resources to plan and execute trial solutions. Emphasis has moved from the imposition of specific problem goals (e.g., community involvement) to the process of problem analysis which allows the cadre more self-definition. It is hoped that demonstrated competence on the job will provide the individual assurance and faculty support to lead the cadre to the planning and presentation of a specific proposal for activities of the post-internship summer and placement year. This pattern emerged spontaneously from the most successful of the first experimental cadres, and seemingly is being repeated in the two most successful cadres this year.

Internship specialist training. In the most successful secondary cadres, special subject-matter skills have been developed as a result of University staff assistance. Throughout the first year, five or six major mathematics projects were developed plus many short-term curriculum segments. Some of the new materials were tested by ten or twelve different teachers in their classrooms, some by only three or four.[3] There was over the year an evident growth in the amount of communication among teachers with respect to sharing of problems and ideas. This year another cadre has begun an in-service curriculum project in mathematics which promises a new direction for the whole mathematics department.

For the English curriculum one University person, three teachers, and two students developed a poetry anthology for use with ninth grade basic students in 1968-69.[4] In whole or in part, it has been tested by all the English teachers at the school and has been found successful. A group of nine people--one University person, four teachers, and four students--has developed a black literature component for levels nine through twelve which is ready for reproduction and will be available for use in other schools next year. These efforts apparently have been instrumental both in gaining general staff acceptance of the cadre and in improving the specialist role training of experienced and intern teachers. Consequently, internship specialist training will move from the pattern of supervision and support typical of the regular training programs to a pattern of in-service training that includes experienced teachers in the target

school. This year the addition of a reading consultant intern at one school has involved cadre and non-cadre faculty in a pilot reading program. If this ten-week project proves successful, the plan is to begin the 1970-71 school year with a concerted effort by all faculty members on reading.

Responsiveness. No two schools are alike. No school situation remains static from September to June. Cadres deliberately involve personnel from various roles in a new working relationship and necessarily experience a period of instability. Thus, despite the focus and direction which are emerging in terms of the six factors described above, it is important that the program be sensitive to the possibility of changing needs to meet rapidly changing conditions. To accomplish this responsiveness, a University representative to serve in a cadre liaison role has been established. The University representative, as noted earlier, is to be responsible directly to the Executive Director of the program, to serve as a resource person to the cadre, and to promote communication among the University faculty, the school administration, the school staff, and the cadre members.

The Evaluation of the Program

The initial proposal called for a half-time research and evaluation director. In keeping with the developmental approach of the program, it was discovered that the research and evaluation could not be administered properly by a part-time person. Therefore, the 1969-70 program incorporates a full-time Director of Research and Evaluation, Mr. Wayne Doyle.

Mr. Doyle has outlined and is pursuing our multi-faceted research and evaluation program. A history of the project, incorporating the chronology and an interpretation, and a view of the social context of the program, is in process. Attention is to be given to the evaluation of the University training phase of the program, focusing on the characteristics of the trainee. This focus will attempt to provide information needed for selection of inner-city school teachers. The program of training is to be described using psychological, sociological, and anthropological techniques to assess the impact of the program on the competence, knowledge, and attitudes of the participants. The placement phase of the program is to be evaluated largely in the school setting. A case study of each cadre, particularly observing its functions as a work group, is in process. The incorporation of the cadre into the total school faculty and the group socialization process will be studies by observation and interview techniques.

The differences in school climate may be a crucial factor in the operation and success of each cadre. Therefore, to ensure meaningful interpretation of the data gathered on each cadre, much background information is being gathered on each school. Written reports from principals and cadre liaison personnel are providing insights into the functions of the cadre in the school, its impact on the school, and its problem-solving ability.

Finally, it is appropriate that the program be evaluated within the framework of its own five broadly stated goals: program development for urban teachers, cadre development and placement, shared

responsibility for the school program, demonstration of the possibilities of a collaborative program, and study of the urban education scene. The evaluation of the program includes procedures for the identification of specific behaviors which appear to be related to each of the goals of the program. Suggestions for other research and evaluation projects include appraisals of the program's impact on teacher behavior in the classroom, pupil behavior, and teacher turnover. The information gathered from this extensive research and evaluation effort is necessary to the demonstration and dissemination aspect of the Ford Training and Placement Program. But equally important is the utilization of the information as a feedback correction mechanism for the continuing operation of the program.

What Can Be Learned from the Cross-Role Cadre Experiences?

How practical is the concept? Perhaps a concrete example or two can, in part, provide some answers. We are convinced that the cadre device is a successful way to bring together the University, school personnel, and the community. We have an outstanding example of the impact this union can have on the climate of a school in the activities of the cadre at Horace Mann Elementary School this year.[5] A concerned, yet suspicious community was contacted by the cadre for assistance in solving control problems at the school. A series of joint meetings was called. The problem was outlined; staff and University resources were mustered. Parents, teachers, administrators, interns, and specialists understood how each role could complement

the others in working on the task. All indicated conditions at the school were improving and plans were made for the group to consider concrete proposals requiring joint efforts of parents, school staff, and students. But each group is committed to this effort, for each has been involved in the design for action.

The cadre experience has made it possible for the community and the school personnel to look to the resources of the University for help. It has forced the University to engage in continuous field experiences which have an immediate impact on the training programs. It has made University training programs more relevant and responsive to the needs of the urban education situation. That seems practical.

The Ford Training and Placement Program has focused attention on the need for periodic retraining of experienced school personnel. Interns in training have been given the interpersonal supports and shared wisdom of the experienced school personnel they need to survive and grow in competence in an inner-city school. The cadres have made it clear that the impact of a trained team is greater than that of any single individual.

From the level of the classroom and the new teacher to that of the General Superintendent of Schools and the Dean of the Graduate School of Education, the program has proved that both organizations can benefit from working closely together.

There may be alternate methods of accomplishing productive working relationships among universities, schools, and communities. Undoubtedly, there are other ways of effectively training personnel

for teaching in the urban school. The cadre is one such device which requires cross-role interaction to operate. The cadre technique forces participants to understand their own and others' role expectations and how each role functions in the social system of the school. These concepts may, in the long run, be more important than the cadre device, for these are the elements of the creative idea at the heart of the Ford Training and Placement Program.

In our contacts with other training institutions and school systems, we shall speak, write, demonstrate what we have learned. We will assist other school systems and universities that wish to work with the Ford Training and Placement Program model. But, we are the first to admit that no conceptual scheme is ever going to provide an exact fit to the realities of urban education. If the concept serves to broaden one's understanding of the circumstances in which the actor finds himself, it has fulfilled its promise. Conceptual systems cannot be judged by their ability to make "practical" decisions. "When all is said and done, the responsibility for making wise choices rests in the only place it can--in the person who must act."[6] If the Ford Training and Placement Program does not meet expectations, it is dysfunctional to blame and discard the idea. Similarly, if the program accomplishes its goals and has an impact on educational training programs, more than a good idea was responsible for the success.

Notes

1. A more complete explication of the theoretical model appears in J. W. Getzels, "Education for the Inner City: A Practical Proposal by an Impractical Theorist," The School Review, Vol. 75, No. 3 (Autumn, 1967).

2. Interview forms and a more complete description of the recruitment and selection procedures for University and school-based participants are available upon request.

3. See paper by Pamela Ames in this collection.

4. See paper by Robert Parker in this collection.

5. See paper by Reverend Lester Bell in this collection.

6. W. W. Charters, Jr., "Knowledge and Intelligent Behaviors: A Framework for the Educative Process," paper presented to the Philosophy of Education Society, St. Louis, Missouri, April 5, 1966.

THE QUALITY AND PROCEDURE OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

An educational experimental project must at some time address itself to the area of curriculum. Whether appropriate changes in curriculum occur at the University or in the public school is not important. However, the fact of meaningful change is important. The Ford Training and Placement Program is unique, because it has affected the life of the University as well as the public schools which it serves.

In the next three documents emphasis is placed on curriculum change and its effect on its recipients. The first paper reviews the results of a summer course which described the rationales for teaching. The writer has included the organizational plans and some of the students' responses to the rationales. The second paper reconstructs the processes of developing a novel English program in a public high school. The author includes the various roles assisting in the project. The third paper also reviews a curriculum program instituted in a school, but this project was in mathematics.

In all three papers change is operating--changes in materials and in people. More importantly, these papers describe the manner in which different people with varying expertise can work together productively.

Robert Rippey: "Rationales for Understanding Teaching: A Ford Summer Program"

Mr. Robert Rippey, Dean of Students for the Division of the Social Sciences, Assistant Professor in the Department of Education, and the 1968-69 Director of Research for the Ford program, initiated a summer

course in the rationales of teaching. Inexperienced and experienced Ford Training and Placement Program teachers were students. The theories discussed and the rationales developed are explicated in his paper.

Robert Parker: "The DuSable English Curriculum Committee"

As an Assistant Professor in the Graduate School of Education, Mr. Robert Parker directs the MATs majoring in English. During the 1968-69 school year, he was directly involved with the development of curriculum changes at the Ford program's DuSable High School cadre. He has recounted the experiences and the results of the group's effort.

Pamela Ames: "A Mathematics Program"

Miss Pamela Ames, an assistant to the MAT mathematics coordinator, organized several curriculum projects in mathematics at the DuSable High School. She recorded the activities of that group and suggested future possibilities.

RATIONALES FOR UNDERSTANDING TEACHING:

A FORD SUMMER PROGRAM

Robert Rippey

In attempting to conceptualize the teaching process, research findings must be limited. If parameters are not placed on research data, the user, the teacher, may focus too narrowly on the problem in an effort to solve a classroom situation. On the other hand, too wide a focus may cause the teacher to be inundated with information. In either situation, the teacher has not solved his problem.[1]

The problem of locating meaningful educational research for the classroom teacher is magnified when working with teacher trainees. The Ford Training and Placement Program's interns, during the 1969 summer program, were anxious to find new solutions to problems of long standing. Like the experienced teacher, the trainee, who was faced with raw innovation unguided by reason, seemed ill-equipped to deal with today's students. If the educational rationales were too complex or too simple, the intern would discard the information. It became apparent that a balance in using educational research would be appropriate.

For the 1969 Ford summer program, a wide range of educational rationales were examined. Approximately thirty-four rationales for understanding teaching were selected for consideration by the trainees. These rationales were not uniformly backed by replicable data. Some were more theoretical than others. However, these

rationales had a common characteristic; they contained concepts which could be behaviorally observed and which seemed to be under the control of the teacher. Personality characteristics and socio-economic characteristics of teachers were not considered; although measurable, these traits were not within the control of the teacher. The list of variables or, as was later suggested, "Things You Can Change in the Classroom" were organized according to Tyler's classical triad of Objectives, Instruction, and Evaluation. The title of the list was not only descriptive, but also suggestive of some hope of changing things in the classroom.

A portion of the summer program was designed to give the trainees some tools for analyzing teaching. This decision was the result of comments from the 1968-1969 trainees and of ideas generated in coordinating committee meetings. The development of a set of rationales to supplement this increased understanding of teaching fitted neatly into the plan for microteaching[2] (a formal segment in the summer program) and into my own interests.[3]

The model which was developed aimed at three points. First, the model should be simple enough to be understood, yet complex enough to cover a wide range of situations. Second, the model should be concerned with behaviors and situations over which the teacher had positive control. Finally, variations in instruction along the dimensions of the model should have a demonstrated effect on student performance. The variables thus determined were, at times, familiar to the culture of teaching while others were not. However, it was

hoped that each variable might suggest a specific way of altering a lesson and of evaluating the effects of the altered lesson in reaching the trainee's goals.

This model was coupled with a bibliography and a schedule of lesson and discussion sessions. Furthermore, it was strongly suggested that trainees apply some of the rationales to their micro-teaching class. At the end of the session, the trainees were asked to:

1. Write a sentence about seven of the variables of their choice, indicating a general understanding of the concept.
2. Write a paragraph about five of the variables of their choice, indicating comprehension of, as well as suggestions for, use of the concept in preparing a lesson.
3. Prepare three lesson plans for short lessons which would utilize a particular variable or rationale.
4. Teach at least one of the lesson plans in a micro-teaching session or in a special class session organized at the pleasure of the trainee.

As might be expected, the first few sessions on objectives failed to capture the imagination of many of the trainees. This may have been due to the traditional antipathy which teachers hold toward discussions of goals, a well documented phenomenon, or because of the fact that these teachers were ready for action and did not care to analyze goals. They knew what they wanted to do and were more

concerned about how to do it than why. When we came to the section on instruction, considerably more enthusiasm developed.

I have selected a number of student's comments to illustrate the variables we discussed. The topics are listed in order in which thye are found on the list in the appendix. The comments on the trainees which I have selected, do not include the entire model. It was not intended that the entire model should be completed during the summer, nor was it assumed that any individual would find all parts of the model equally useful. These comments are simply presented to provide the reader with a flavor of parts of the model as perceived by the trainees.

Domain

The trinity! Cognitive, affective, and psychomotor--CAP. The first grader must be introduced to all three almost simultaneously. For this child it may be better to reverse the order. Since the small muscles are not finely developed, it would be better to work on devleoping motor and eye coordination. Secondly, it is most important to try and implant in him a hunger and a thirst for answers to his questions (questions for information and knowledge). Only then can we begin to feed him the theory, facts, and skills that the curriculum guides set forth.

Romance

The initial stage in Whitehead's theory of the cycle of education is on disciplined freedom, thus encouraging discovery,

curiosity, and experimentation; furthermore, its application to classroom instruction should be effective, particularly in mathematics, science, and social studies.

Positive Reinforcement

Positive reinforcement increases the behavior being reinforced. This may be done in quite a few ways, such as saying "good work," etc. When trying to apply positive reinforcement, it is very important to know the class and to determine what constitutes reinforcement for the child, as each child is different. It is very important to use the child's reinforcement and not your own. This might be done with the issuing of tokens as rewards which the child could redeem for prizes at the end of a certain time. One could evaluate the positive reinforcement if the behavior being reinforced is increased.

Negative Reinforcement

Negative reinforcement increases behavior which will remove the source of reinforcement. The new behavior is not very predictable.

Flanders Model

The Flanders Model is a method for recording verbal behavior in the classroom. The verbal behavior of the teacher is direct or indirect. Student response, student initiation, and silence or confusion are also considered. The model is used by recording the behavior in the classroom every three minutes. This recording can

be done for an entire class period or for a short period of time. This recording can help a teacher to be aware of how much time he spends talking in class; how much time the students spend talking; how much time the teacher spends trying to talk directly to and with students; and how much time the teacher spends lecturing, giving instructions, and giving criticism. A chart can be made after the three second recording is finished which can indicate what behavior led to another. For instance, does the teacher ask a question, not get a response immediately and follow this by silence (time for students to consider the question) or does the teacher ask a question, not get a response immediately and follow this by lecturing on the answer to the question?

Ecology

Someday the really ideal school and classroom will be built. This will be done when the architect and the teacher get together to plan it. Of course, it will help to have J. Paul Getty and Howard Hughes plus the Ford Foundation donate the money for the construction of such an edifice. In the meantime, here are my ten "commandments" for the classroom:

1. Lots of light, both natural and artificial.
2. Let the rooms be large, Large, LARGE on the 1st floor only (no 2nd or 3rd floors, please) and all air-conditioned.
3. Each room with a sink, toilet facilities, and many electrical outlets.

4. A storage room or closet in each room to accommodate large size paper like newsprint and construction paper; shelves for textbooks for each child, art supplies (paints, brushes, scissors, paste, etc.); filing cabinets to hold masters and duplicated materials, pictures, teacher reference books.
5. Carpeted floors and acoustical tile ceilings.
6. Plenty of chalkboards and bulletin boards--some of them movable.
7. Standard equipment for each room:
   a. Paper cutter
   b. Liquid duplicator
   c. Radio with earphones
   d. Record player with earphones
   e. Tape recorder with earphones
   f. Overhead projector
   g. Movie projector
   h. Filmstrip projector
   i. Electric pencil sharpener
   j. Inter-com system to the office
   k. Adequate cloakroom space for winter outer clothing and especially boots
   l. A clock that is synchronized with the bells
8. An exit from each room onto a lawn (for learning activities in nice weather) and for arrival and dismissal of students thereby eliminating hallway congestion.
9. Movable furniture that is the appropriate size for the student and extra chairs plus tables of various shapes for different centers of interest and activities.
10. An enthusiastic teacher.

Time-Speeded Speech

Research has indicated that blind students were able to comprehend speech that was up to six times its normal pace. While a teacher would have difficulty speeding up his normal speech six times without the use of some electronic equipment, it seems valuable to be aware that all those pauses which we sometimes feel are just the thing which emphasize our points are possibly just wasted time. I think being well prepared and knowing what I want to say would aid me in speeding my speech in class. This could be tested and improved by using a tape recorder both in and out of class.

What Can You Do in a Day?

It is a common condition in many schools that student absenteeism is a large factor in the failure of the educational institution to instruct competently. This failure occurs, to some extent, because lessons are constructed on an incremental basis, one lesson depending on and evolving from the previous one. Therefore, a student who is absent one day will be automatically unable to do the next day's lesson successfully without a great deal of repetition on the part of the teacher, to the detriment of other students. An alternative to this type of structured curriculum would be one which is a totally self-contained unit. The student would need only himself, not any previous instruction, as a basis for learning. Planning this type of a lesson takes a great deal of imagination on the part of the teacher.

Sense Modality--Sight, Smell, Hearing, Touch, Taste, and Combinations

It seems increasingly clear that to educate the child, and especially the "culturally disadvantaged" child, requires more than one of the child's senses for more meaningful learning. The senses to be employed will depend on the subject one is trying to learn. In order to learn, all senses must be utilized. Further, we must involve the child. He must learn by doing. If he is to learn to write, he must take pencil in hand and make meaningful marks. To know the difference between "hot" and "cold," he must touch things having these qualities and see the written symbol for them. The "disadvantaged" child can learn from a peer who may tutor him. The peer tutor, through repetition, reinforces his own knowledge.

Maturity

Some first graders want only love and affection to produce work that might be considered beyond their capabilities. For this child an extra word of encouragement is needed, a little warmer smile, or a little additional pat on the back to help him gain confidence. When he feels more secure he then will be able to walk less afraid with his peers. Others, because of the love and security they receive from their parents,need less demonstration of love, but do require respect, recognition for a job well done, and fair play. The more mature child is usually more articulate. They all feel that they are no longer babies, but sometimes cannot cope with some situations; therefore, though they desire freedom, they feel

more secure when they are restricted and disciplined. They are quite happy when certain decisions are made for them. They do not really object to being grouped where they feel they are equal to their peers. Deviation from a schedule can frustrate them momentarily, but to break a promise is tantamount to a major "happening." They can be incredibly cruel on the one hand, and, on the other, unbelievably sympathetic. They are a hodge-podge of contradictions, a major source of a teacher's frustration, and a joy to behold.

Treatment of Uncertainty

The concept deals with the student in the stage of learning where he does not know something or where he thinks he might know or is not sure. Since this is the case so often with students, it seems reasonable to deal with it rather than take the usual course of concentrating only on the right answer or the paradigm in an area. Rippey proposes that a child be given the right to apportion the points available on a given multiple choice problem according to the degree of certainty in his answer. From a philosophical standpoint, this strikes me as just and reasonable method. In my own classroom, I hope to deal extensively with student uncertainty. I feel that a great deal of learning and reinforcement can go on in this area.

Notes

1. Esin Kaya, Muriel Gernard, Anne Stasiewski, and David Berenson, Developing a Theory of Educational Practice for the Elementary School (Norwalk, Conn.: Norwalk Board of Education, 1967).

2. Dwight Allen and Kevin Ryan, Microteaching (Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley, 1969), p. 151.

3. Robert Rippey, "The Ginther Model: Four Dimensions of Research on Instruction," Elementary School Journal, Vol. 69, No. 4 (January, 1969), pp. 215-23; Robert Rippey, "Are You There, Can You Hear Me?" Integrated Education, Vol. 7, No. 5 (September, 1969), pp. 3-9; Robert Rippey, "The Use of Reinforcement in Inner City Classrooms," Integrated Education (in press).

THE DUSABLE ENGLISH CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Robert Parker

Since the Summer of 1968 the Graduate School of Education (University of Chicago) and the DuSable High School English Department have been involved cooperatively in a series of English curriculum projects designed to improve the quality and variety of curricular offerings in English at DuSable. There have, so far, been three stages to this work, all made possible by the support of the Ford Training and Placement Program.

During the Summer of 1968 the nucleus of the DuSable English Curriculum Committee, Mrs. Edith Ross, Mr. Robert P. Parker, and Mr. James Dalton, with assistance from Mrs. Liane Clorfene of Kenwood High School, developed a poetry anthology for use with Basic students. This anthology, composed primarily of poems by black poets, was intended to provide poems for these students which would connect with their experience, their feelings, and their dreams--to "turn them on" to the excitement of finding personal meaning in one kind of literature. This anthology was mimeographed and used at DuSable in the fall and winter of 1968-69 with a variety of English classes: Basic, Essential, and Regular.

While the poetry anthology was being tried out, the Committee wrestled with the question of where to go from here. By the early winter, we had decided that we wished to convene a larger committee, composed equally of faculty and students, to address itself to some kind of broader curriculum problem. Again with the support of the

FTPP, we expanded the DuSable English Curriculum Committee from three members to nine members. Mrs. Constance Montgomery of the English Department and Mrs. Shirley Robinson of the Library staff joined the Committee, as did Tillie Randle, Ronald York, Norman Wheaton, and Theoretta Bryant, all students at DuSable (one senior, one sophomore, and two freshmen). The group decided to set itself the task of developing a four-year Black Literature component to balance and supplement the standard Board of Education literature curriculum. The Committee met every two weeks from January through June. Each member chose a particular type of literature to investigate--poetry or biography or short stories, for instance--and the group as a whole made decisions about what titles should be included and what year(s) or level(s) they should be recommended for. In the process of shaping the curriculum, the students played an equal role with faculty in making these decisions. Thus, there were really two significant outcomes: (1) a curriculum for teachers to work with in 1969-70, and (2) a new kind of communication and respect between students and faculty. One faculty member was heard to remark: "I've never heard students say things like this before."

The third stage began in September 1969. At the first meeting of the DuSable English Department Mrs. Ross presented the Committee's plan for the systematic incorporation of Black Literature into English classes at the various levels. Mr. Robert Parker of The University of Chicago met with Mr. Lucente, newly appointed Principal of DuSable High School, Mrs. Dorothy Sides, newly appointed Chairman of the English Department, Mr. James Dalton, and Mrs. Ross to review and

explain the project. Mr. Lucente expressed his approval and began immediately to assist us in obtaining the $500 which the Board of Education had promised for the purchase of books. To match the Board's contribution, the FTPP pledged $500, also for book purchase.

Mr. Parker succeeded in getting Miss Maxine Daly, Director of the Urban Teacher Corps of Washington, D.C., to come on September 24 and conduct two in-service training sessions on the teaching of literature. Miss Daly gave both inspiration and practical help to DuSable English teachers. She also left many sample books, bibliographies, lesson plans, and other materials which were immediately utilized by some teachers.

The $500 from The University of Chicago became available about October 20, and we made our first book order from the Ellis Book Store. This source, unfortunately, could supply only a few of the titles ordered, though they have continued to send the order in parts.

The $500 promised by the Board of Education was made available about November 20. When Mrs. Theresa Leonard, Assistant Principal in Charge of Instruction, attempted to get the additional orders placed she was informed by the Board of Education that the order would not be processed until after January 1, 1970.

Books now being circulated among teachers in the English Department are: The Learning Tree, Choice of Weapons, Black Rage, Uncle Tom's Children, Notes of a Native Son, The Fire Next Time, Invisible Man, American Negro Short Stories, and Jubilee.

An adequate report on the impact of this curriculum cannot be made at this time because of the delay in receiving the books. Many teachers have not yet initiated the program in their classes. Some hope to begin during the second semester. Teachers making use of the books mentioned above are, with exception of Invisible Man, Uncle Tom's Children, and Jubilee, those teaching Basic English and Essential English 1.

Due to the fact that the Movie, Learning Tree, was being shown locally during September and October we persuaded many students to purchase their own copies of Learning Tree which they read before taking a field trip to see the movie. The combination proved to be quite satisfying for the several hundred students who took the field trip. On November 18 about 200 juniors and seniors saw Dutchman by LeRoi Jones at Harper Court Theatre. Approximately 500 students saw James Baldwin's Amen Corner at the Auditorium on January 21, 1970.

Teachers who have been able to use the limited number of books express satisfaction with the responses of the students. More than one teacher has reported that when Basic English students were reading The Learning Tree, they would hurry to class and,without waiting to be told what to do, get books from the storage cabinet, sit down and begin to read. Because the number of books is limited, no student is allowed to take a book home. Nevertheless, some of the books disappear, especially Jubilee, The Learning Tree, A Choice of Weapons, and the collections of short stories. We hope they are being read by someone.

We are planning to present the "Red, White, and Black: Minorities in America" Paperback Exhibit, beginning on or about February 9. Through this, we hope to encourage students to buy paperbacks and extend their reading interests.

The Committee appreciates the support and resources of The University of Chicago, which has enabled us to move this far with the project. The Committee also appreciates the assistance and encouragement of Mr. Lucente who has contributed much to help get the project moving at DuSable. We are indebted also to Mrs. Leonard for her tireless efforts in getting financial arrangements made, putting orders through, keeping a record of the books received, and making it possible for us to get the Combined Paperback Book Exhibit in February.

It is hard to assess the success or failure of the Committee's work. On the surface, it may seem to have taken a long time to do what appears to be relatively little. This inference, if one is tempted to draw it, must be weighed against the fact that change in the Chicago Public Schools takes place with excruciating slowness. On the positive side are several things: a continuing relationship between the University and DuSable, the accomplishment of a successful student-faculty committee in developing curriculum, and a movement toward better dialogue and greater unity within the DuSable English Department. Whether we have kept significant numbers of lower track students from cutting classes or dropping out of school is not known; probably we haven't. Whether we have achieved increased literacy and confidence in many students is not known either. Nevertheless, we who participated feel that our efforts, and others' money, were not misspent.

A MATHEMATICS PROGRAM

Pamela Ames

The curriculum efforts in mathematics at DuSable began among some fortunate circumstances: a new mathematics department chairman who was cooperative and eager, excellent administrative backing for program efforts, ample supplies, allocation of a work space to the mathematics department, and a consultant available on a regular and continuing basis. Under these circumstances impressive growth is evident in the mathematics staff at DuSable. Should this be followed up with continuing effort and support over the next few years, this department may well develop into a "model situation" where an existing school staff has marshalled itself so that sound curriculum efforts can be seen happening within the framework of an inner-city school program.

Our original group for the summer of 1968 consisted of two Masters of Arts in Teaching interns and one experienced teacher who were members of the DuSable Ford Training and Placement Program cadre, two other experienced DuSable teachers who happened to be on campus in connection with an NSF summer program, the FTPP mathematics consultant, the MAT mathematics coordinator, and the newly appointed chairman of the DuSable mathematics department who was teaching summer school at DuSable.

That summer, these teachers focused in two areas: converting a storage room into a work space at DuSable for the school year and beginning to develop new materials to be used during the school year.

Once school began, the mathematics consultant was at DuSable every day from 8:00 A.M. until noon. We regard this continuous availability as very important in establishing rapport with the entire department and in building department-wide involvement. For the first six weeks, the mathematics consultant actually worked as a teacher aide in 2 or 3 classrooms per day, principally with the interns. This helped the consultant acquire an understanding of this particular student body and allowed her to speak from the basis of actual involvement in the classroom situation. Besides this involvement, the consultant helped in the new departmental work room often as a secretary or clerk and more often just listening to teachers. It took some two to three months before teachers other than the FTPP interns began asking for help relative to classroom materials, but we now feel that the time lag was worthwhile and even essential in establishing genuine working relationships.

Throughout the year, six major projects were developed plus many short-term games, projects, or interest builders. Some of the new materials were tested by 10 or 12 different teachers in their classrooms, some by only 3 or 4. Four of these projects were revised and printed in quantity during the summer of 1969. They include: (1) a set of word problems on separate cards to build reading skills and utilize the five minutes often wasted at the beginning of class (Mission Impossible Cards); (2) decks of playing cards with fractions instead of whole numbers which can be used to teach basic concepts, reducing, equivalence, and ordering (Fractions Cards); (3) a booklet

that builds basic fraction concepts through real life models and geometric figures (Fractions: Concept Before Operations); (4) a booklet that spirally develops perceptual skills and inductive reasoning using geometric patterns and natural orderings of numbers and letters (See It Like It Is). All of these projects are presently being incorporated into the regular program at DuSable.

During the school year 1968/1969, there was an increasing amount of communication among teachers with respect to sharing of problems and ideas. A genuine sense of identity began to build within the department, as evidenced by comments from others throughout the school and by strongly voiced intentions to keep teaching at DuSable rather than apply for transfer to other teaching assignments. (In fact, there were no mathematics staff changes.) The FTPP interns were well assimilated into the department and the school; they were able both to offer ideas to and receive ideas from the other teachers. The measurable amount of progress so far is probably small relative to the needs, but a good working basis was established from which University personnel and local staff can move forward. This mathematics staff could well become a model both for absorbing new teachers and resources productively and for demonstrating how an existing inner-city department staff can marshall its own forces on behalf of an improved program for the youngsters.

Growth and change have continued during the 1969/1970 school year. Many supplies and teaching aids have been added and are being used: Cuisenare rods, desk calculators, geo-boards as well as

overhead projectors and thermofax machine that makes duplicating masters from typed copy. The University consultant still works with the department but on a greatly reduced schedule: about one day every two weeks. New projects are being developed and classroom tested. The teachers do much sharing of ideas and materials.

For the future, the greatest curriculum need in the mathematics department is a clearly defined, continuous program where the teachers have a good idea of what mathematics was done in the student's previous year and how it was approached. However, this will develop only after there is a strong spirit of interaction and cooperation in the department and some longevity of staff.

In retrospect, three things seem to have contributed most positively to the success of our efforts:

(1) A decision to develop non-test book, non-verbal mathematics experiences that will be meaningful in the student's world. These units would use real world application wherever possible, use physical models with strong tactile/visual appeal and have high student involvement.

(2) A departmental work space at the school which provided a place for interaction of staff and display of available projects and aids.

(3) A consultant who was constantly available on a regular, continuing basis, had actually been in the DuSable classrooms enough to speak from an insider's position, and was willing to help teachers try new materials in their classrooms with maximum support and feedback.

THE EFFECT OF THE FORD TRAINING AND PLACEMENT PROGRAM ON ROLE FUNCTION AND ROLE DEVELOPMENT

One of the major purposes of the Ford Training and Placement Program is to foster more competent educational professionals. In addition to this responsibility, the project has affected other roles which function in this program.

In the following documents there is a description of the induction of a role specialist in the public schools, a unique element that is found in the Ford program; review of the cadre's effectiveness in a community; and a discussion by three administrative role members and their effect on one another, on the program and the program's effect on them.

Admittedly, these papers represent differing viewpoints, but then the Ford program touches many different people.

Frederick F. Lighthall: "Problems of Communication and Cooperation Among School Staff Members: A Focus for an Interning Social Psychological Specialist"

Mr. Frederick Lighthall, Associate Professor in the Department of Education, is coordinator of the program training the social psychological specialist, a new role for the public schools. In his collaborative paper, he discusses this new role as it operates in a school.

Stephen E. Harkness: "Problems of Communication and Cooperation Among School Staff Members: A Focus for an Interning Social Psychological Specialist"

Mr. Stephen Harkness, a pseudonym for a social psychological specialist, contributes the practical aspects of the induction of this role into a school's social system.

Lester Bell: "A Community Representative's View of the Cadre: An Interview"

Reverend Lester Bell, community representative to the Horace Mann cadre, recounts his relationship with the cadre and the cadre's development during this school year.

Dorothy Berg:

"Personal Reflections of a Principal Participating in the Ford Program"

Mrs. Dorothy Berg, Principal of the Horace Mann Elementary School, has been a dynamic asset to the growth of the interns and to the progress of the cadre at her school. As an administrator, her view of the cadre is essential.

Carol Thackham:

"The Public School As a Setting for Field Work Instruction in Social Work: A Coordinated Program with Teacher Training"

Miss Carol Thackham, a Field Work Assistant Professor in the School of Social Service Administration, has worked diligently with the Horace Mann cadre. Her specific responsibility has been the inclusion of the specialist roles in the cadre.

Geraldine Brownlee:

"The Cadre Liaison/Curriculum Coordinator Role"

Mrs. Geraldine Brownlee, cadre liaison for Horace Mann and curriculum coordinator for the Master of Science in Teaching program for the University, is responsible for the total operational aspects of the cadre. As liaison she bridges the University, school, and community concerns. It is fitting that she close this segment of the "Resource Papers."

PROBLEMS OF COMMUNICATION AND COOPERATION AMONG SCHOOL STAFF MEMBERS: A FOCUS FOR AN INTERNING SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL SPECIALIST

Frederick F. Lighthall and Stephen E. Harkness

How can school staffs be helped in their desire to work more cooperatively together in pursuing their joint educational goals? That is one of the central questions to which we address ourselves in developing a new role of social psychological specialist. Two interns are now in schools; two were in schools last year. One of the interns, Harkness, is in his second year of internship in the same school. His experiences provide an illustration of the role. A more abstract description of the role has appeared elsewhere.[1]

The intern worked in his first year under priorities set by himself, by his supervisor, and by the principal. Since experience shows that roles whose priorities are set chiefly by those who occupy the roles and not by the organization in which they work tend to become walled off from central organizational functions, we viewed the arrangements of the first year as provisional only and made more acceptable organizational arrangements the second year.

The principal was eager to have the social psychological specialist work under priorities that would be set by an advisory committee. The committee was composed of the three administrators of the school and heads of all professional departments, including the library. Problems of communication and cooperation identified by this group as having their high priority would receive the most focal attention

by the social psychological practitioner. He was to be a member of the advisory committee, which would meet bi-weekly.

This arrangement approximates very closely the organizational schema that we believe, at the present time, to be the ideal one for operations at the building level; we have yet to work out the organizational arrangements we currently believe to be best at the district or system-wide level.[2]

The first order of business was to ask the advisory committee to establish a sub-committee of its members that could ordinarily meet every two weeks and perhaps initially more often as a working committee. Three members of the advisory committee, an assistant principal, the librarian, and a teacher who was also the school's union representative either volunteered or were asked by the principal to become members of the sub-committee. Both the advisory committee and the sub-committee have met a number of times to date.

The intern has worked with committee members, individually and as committees, on the task of turning ventilations of frustration and conflict among staff members into written statements of problems for more deliberate examination by the advisory committee. His source of testimony has been almost exclusively the members of the advisory committee, especially the members of the sub-committee. Each of these persons has extensive and different contacts with the whole school's staff and therefore, as a group, they are in a position to comment on a great variety of problems.

The intern's emphasis in promoting discussion about school problems is away from those that might be called "personality" or "personal" problems or styles and toward those more properly thought of as existing between people, between roles, and between levels of the organization, such as unclear or violated expectations or role conflict. Some of the problems eventually identified by the sub-committee were, for example, a certain department's services not being as available to the whole school as members felt they ought to be, an uncomfortable variety of standards for job performance ("people not doing their jobs"), confusion about administrative expectations in certain important regards, and the need to scream very loudly and very persistently in order to get a response from "them."

Once a number of problems, specifically illustrated (e.g. I have to read the local newspaper to find out when the next PTA meeting will be), were put into language that captured what sub-committee members had been saying, the initial list of problems constituted a mechanism for slowing down deliberation and focusing meaning. The list was then handed out at an advisory committee for comment, questions, and discussion geared both toward understanding and toward setting priorities among problems to be worked on subsequently. The extent of participation and the intensity of comment in two advisory committee meetings were evidence of the relevance and accuracy of the sub-committee's problem formulations.

Next steps will be for the advisory committee as a whole to select one problem for work, at which point the sub-committee will formulate alternative possibilities for solution, which, again, will be scrutinized by the advisory committee with an eye to choosing preferred means of working on the high priority problem.

The social psychological specialist's own contribution, besides understanding and engendering trust in others, has been to bring sub-committee members together to elicit concerns, to focus on problems rather than immediate solutions, to draw attention to others' points of view, and to speculate about probable consequences of action. Perhaps the most tangible product of the social psychological specialist's own contribution has been a written list of questions that advisory committee members might well ask in regard to each of the problems identified by the sub-committee. The questions the specialist suggested were: 1) Which of these problems reflects a more serious underlying problem and what is that underlying problem? 2) Which of these problems is only temporary or trivial? 3) Does this list of problems suggest others that should be considered? 4) Which of these problems do you think nothing can be done about? and 5) Which of these problems concerns you the most? Can you say something more specific about that problem, e.g. examples or incidents? What is the problem as you see it?

The social psychologist's presence in the school (twenty regularly scheduled hours per week) has produced increased cooperation in collective attention to social processes--e.g., the frequency,

accuracy, authenticity, and relevance of communication. Standards of adequacy of communication or cooperation have come from members of the staff and not from imported theory or from the social psychological specialist himself. This cooperative attention to social process has produced, besides the simple innovation of a list of problems derived from staff members themselves, a joint discussion of those problems that has rarely if ever taken place among so many of the high-power staff members.

Notes

1. Frederick F. Lighthall, "A Social Psychologist for School Systems," Psychology in the Schools, Vol. 6, No. 1 (1969), pp. 3-12.

2. Ibid.

A COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE'S VIEW OF THE CADRE: AN INTERVIEW

As told by Rev. Lester Bell to Sandra McClenney

On Tuesday afternoon, February 24, Rev. Lester Bell consented to an interview concerning the Ford Training and Placement Program's cadre at Horace Mann Elementary School. As president of the PTA and as an active participant in the community's activities, Rev. Bell had some very crucial comments on the progress of the cadre in the eyes of the community. Although he is very busy, he found time to share with the Ford program some of his insights.

M.* How were you introduced to the Ford program and to the cadre?

B.** Several members of the Mann PTA asked me if I would like the Ford program in the school. I didn't know anything about the program's goals or possibilities. However, I was sure that it couldn't possibly harm the school.

Last year the school was in turmoil. There was little trust between teachers and parents. Neither group knew how to help the other. Problems seemed to mount, especially with the addition of a new principal, who had had no previous administrative experience. As PTA president, I could see the obstacles increasing but couldn't see solutions. Maybe this program could help.

* M. represents the initial of the reported.

** B. represents the initial of Rev. Bell.

M. What did you expect of the cadre?

B. Quite frankly, I expected miracles. I hoped that this new group would be able to solve all the school's problems. On the other hand, I had no reaction to any specific program plans of the cadre. I just expected them to have solutions.

M. When you became a member of the cadre, what did you learn?

B. I realized at once that the cadre could not work miracles. This was a disappointment, but I felt a sense of security in this group. Even though they could not work miracles, they represented an ally, an assistant, in dealing with school/community problems.

I could see the cadre's moral support lessening the frustration of getting problems discussed in the school and raising the trust level between the community and the school.

I discovered that the cadre was sincerely interested in involving the community in the school. This fact brought the cadre and me closer together.

M. What other kinds of support did the cadre offer?

B. Initially, the cadre could only give moral support, because they were struggling with the problem of becoming competent professionals. They had and still have a commitment to act on issues concerning the school and the community.

From the very beginning, I felt secure in taking problems to the cadre, because I knew they would listen. Of course, I was dis-

heartened when my problems were merely discussed and not solved, but the "discussing" was later changed to "doing."

M. How did this "doing" manifest itself?

B. There were several issues discussed in the PTA meetings. One concern focused on the volunteer program, which was initiated last year but was never really organized. The real benefits of parents assisting teachers were never made clear to the teachers or parents. Parents were still offering their services but to no avail.

I brought this problem to the cadre. Mrs. Geraldine Brownlee, cadre liaison, Mrs. Carol Thackham, social worker supervisor, and the cadre volunteered to organize the program. Mrs. Brownlee got the program "off the ground" and later one of the volunteers began to manage it. At this point, additional volunteers are needed to fill the requests of the teachers. This program is a success.

At another PTA meeting, a suggestion was made to organize a discipline meeting for parents and teachers, where school problems could be discussed. As I began discussing this idea with the principal, Mrs. Berg, I realized that a more meaningful approach would be a workshop. The discipline workshop would allow teachers and parents to work on long and short range issues until they were solved. With the assistance of Taylor Griffin, community liaison for the Ford program, the workshop was initiated. As a result of

the Saturday workshop, four groups were established. These groups, comprised of teachers (cadre and non-cadre) and parents are working on specific discipline problem areas. On March 19 at an all-school PTA meeting, these groups will offer suggestions for solving their respective problems.

This project was a success because of the joint effort of the cadre, the school, the community, and the Ford staff. Through letters and conferences by cadre members, other teachers, the community, and the administration, the problem of the school's supplies and of the physical plant of the school have been solved. This effort required collaborating with the school, community, and Ford staff.

These are only a few of the activities that the cadre-school/community have accomplished in an effort to improve the school and the school/community relations.

M. What might have happened without the cadre?

B. I think we, the community, could have accomplished some of the goals, but it would not have been as easy or as fast. We need the support of the cadre and the total Ford program in order to accomplish meaningful educational change.

M. What's going to happen in June?

B. I'm hoping, and so is the community, that the program will not "pull out" of the school. After a second year, more positive

things could be seen. If they leave now, everything that has happened will be lost, because the community will be left "high and dry."

M. Do you expect the same level of support next year?

B. Not the same level but at least the physical presence of the cadre. As a group, we have the goal of including more of the Mann teachers in the cadre and making them feel a genuine part of the program. We need to educate the community on the issues affecting the school and how the community can help. There are many unsolved issues that need action. I hope the cadre will keep them in mind for next year.

The Ford Training and Placement Program is very pleased with Rev. Bell's candid remarks and his concern for the improvement of the program at his school. We need the community's comments in order to build a better cross-role relationship in the cadre, in the school, and between institutions. How do professionals, para-professionals, and trainees work together? Rev. Bell has given some insights into the possibilities of the cross-role concept working in the Horace Mann cadre.

PERSONAL REFLECTIONS OF A PRINCIPAL PARTICIPATING IN THE FORD PROGRAM

Dorothy Berg

"It's up to you! You're the Principal. If YOU want the program we can have it here at Mann!" It was Spring, 1969, and several concerned parents at Horace Mann School wanted to be sure that the principal did all she could to have the Ford Training and Placement Program of The University of Chicago placed at the school. Being receptive to help from any source, I investigated further, and discovered a major component of the theory behind the Ford program:

"The conception of the school as a social system suggests that roles never function in isolation, but always in complementary relationship to other roles."[1] In practice this meant that the Ford program could not be imposed upon a school by any one person, not even the Principal. However, it could be placed at a school if there was a commitment from many people in different roles--administration, teachers, special staff, community. Fortunately at Mann we found such commitment on the part of those who would function in the various roles of the Ford program.

The Horace Mann Cadre of the Ford Training and Placement Program was formed with six experienced teachers from the school, five University-based teacher-interns, two social worker-interns, and an adult educator-intern. (The adult educator participated in the summer program, but was not placed at the school in the Fall.)

The implementation, operation, and coordination of the program was directed by the Ford cadre liaison who also served as the University's Curriculum Coordinator. The social workers were aided by the University's Social Services Supervisor. A group process specialist served to reflect and direct the development of group interactions. This group had the task of "making a difference" in the educational program of an urban school beset with the typical problems of the inner-city: increasing enrollment, over-crowding; racially changing student body, faculty, and community; staff turnover; shortage of supplies; aging building; etc. The supplementary chart gives an overview of the program as it was organized for the 1969-70 school year.

It is recognized that any benefits which accrue to the school, pupils, faculty, or community are benefits which aid the principal. It is also recognized that many such benefits have resulted from the work of the Horace Mann Cadre and the Ford Training and Placement Program. It is not specifically the purpose of this paper to report upon these benefits nor to evaluate the gains of the program as such. Instead the focus of this paper will be on the role of the principal and the impact that the cadre had on that role and the impact on the individual acting in the role. The role of principal will be examined in relation to the four aspects of the practical proposal of J. W. Getzels:[2] focused preparation of school personnel; coordinated preparation of school personnel; placement of cadres or role sets; and establishment of demonstration and induction schools.

THE FORD TRAINING AND PLACEMENT PROGRAM AT HORACE MANN

Organizational Framework

Geraldine Brownlee, University Liaison
Dorothy D. Berg, Principal
Rev. Lester Bell, P.T.A. President and Community Representative

PRIMARY	INTERMEDIATE	UPPER
Classrooms: Kg - 118 - Wright 1st - 101 - Iback	Classrooms: 6th grade program 221 - Swain Stanek 117 - McCord 119 - Nettles Bey	Classrooms: vacancy
Special Services: Reading in Small group instruction Staab Science Instruction Imes	Special Services: Music and Art Hopkins	Special Services: Remedial Reading Consultant: Abatso Remedial Mathematics Consultant: Ames

Social Workers: Talsky and Weidman
receive referrals from all teachers

The concepts of "cadre" and "cross-roles" as developed in the Ford proposal have been put into practice at Mann. Through the mechanism of the cadre (all members participating as a group) communication between, understanding of, and support for the roles of individuals helping to achieve the goals of an educational system have been realized.

The organization "chart" of the cadre does not show the dynamics of the coordination and cooperation between the classrooms and the special services, between grade levels and between subject matter areas.

The personal dimension of the program at Mann is characterized by a "mix" of qualifications and qualities in both the University based and Mann based participants: experienced and "new" to teaching; black and white; male and female; reserved and forceful; doers and thinkers; all working together.

Horace Mann is unique in the formal and legitimized role given to the community in the active participation of Lester Bell. The expansion of the role of the community is being considered as an aspect of the summer proposal.

Suggestions: Broaden to reach more faculty members.
Increase years of involvement at the school.

"The Ford Program will become the Enemy!" With this warning from an experienced administrator ringing in my ear, I began phase one of the program: the focused and coordinated preparation of the school personnel enlisted in the 1969 summer program. I soon realized that the experienced administrator was right in many ways! The focus seemed to be on me, the administrator, and the coordination was concerned with the tasks of administration! The cadre concept seemed to legitimize teacher lounge grip sessions! Suddenly I, the usually "hard to see" principal was on hand to give ready answers, solve all the problems, and serve as target for interrogation. The cadre was there to help me with the administrative tasks of the school, and I was needed to give them instant policies and procedures of Horace Mann School.

I felt that the cadre should be concentrating on curriculum and classroom teaching methods. I was perfectly capable of working out the bell schedule and recess duty. As I saw it, my job was to facilitate their educational tasks. Needless to say, very often during that summer I left the scene.

It took many weeks of interactions and reactions to actually communicate with each other in an open, non-defensive, positive way. While the cadre and I had common goals, the educational program and welfare of students at Mann, and similar empathy--they wanted to help me and I needed their help--we had to work out what was meant by their offer of support. Through dynamics of the group process, support came to mean something entirely different from a "whitewash" of everything done or said by the administration. Support finally

meant "buying into a part of the problem." Horace Mann became "our school," "our problem," and "our program." We were working together.

I had suggested the inclusion of a community component into the formal membership of the cadre. After a summer presentation of the Ford program to the community, we were able to include representation from the community. The PTA President became a very active and dedicated member of the cadre. This meant, however, that "what was wrong with Horace Mann" was no longer under the rug, but was now known to everyone. Having the community person in an active participant role with the cadre again required an open and honest stance on the part of administration and teachers. This openness, in turn, kept the channels of communication operating in two directions. And similarly to the more fruitful meaning of support we began to develop viable meanings for "community involvement and participation" for the urban school. To the principal this turned out to be another avenue of support.

Early last year at an Open Meeting on the Problems of Horace Mann, I had to stand alone to answer questions and accusations concerned with the quality of the educational program and disciplinary standards of the school. I, the administrator of the school for less than six months, had to defend MY school.

However, in the fall after the summer program and several months of work with the cadre, we presented the Ford Program to the community. This meeting was also very well attended, but there was a difference. I was part of an impressive cadre presentation of

what WE were doing at Mann. Mann was no longer just the principal's school; teachers were involved in THEIR school.

By January another important PTA-Community meeting was held, and the administration, cadre, and faculty were joined by the strongest component of all--the parents and community. Horace Mann was now OUR school.

In the focused preparation aspect of the program, the University supplied other resources to Mann which substantially aided the over-burdened principal. The Ford cadre liaison formulated a dynamic and significant Volunteer Program for the school. She integrated the new volunteer role into the school's activities. After an appropriate orientation for the teachers and volunteers, the liaison was able to hand the on-going successful operation to a PTA Volunteer Chairman. The program continues to grow in numbers and benefits.

At the Workshop on Discipline the community, parents, administration, teachers, and students worked together towards developing the responsibilities that each must assume to effectively reach common goals. This project was coordinated by the Ford community liaison.

The Ford Training and Placement Program staff has been most responsive to specific needs of the school. Upper grade reading and mathematics consultants were assigned to Mann, specialized curriculum materials and equipment were purchased, and in-service programs were developed and presented to the entire faculty by FTPP staff members. Not only was there support, but there was immediate responsive help from the University.

The second phase of the program, the coordinated preparation of school personnel, increased the understanding of the various roles in a school's social system. Everyone working in the school had a role which related to other roles; the professional and personal skills of each role interacted and reacted. The cross-roles experiences operationalized the theoretical concept that "the greater the mutual understanding and acceptance among various education personnel, the more likely the effectiveness and efficiency of the school."[3] Expectations became more realistic and respect, morale, esprit rose.

"Are they really worth the trouble, Mrs. Berg?" This comment was heard more than once from different non-cadre faculty members when the third phase of the program--the placement of role sets or cadres--took effect at Mann. Placement meant a more effective teamwork approach to the tasks, better utilization of space, greater efficiency in the programs already functioning at the school, and most important mutual help for accomplishment of common goals. However, placement had its pitfalls.

In placing the cadre, the principal had to be cautious. I had to be the administrator of Horace Mann and not the leader for an elitist corps. School policy could not be determined by the small cadre group nor could special favors be granted to them. The greater faculty was aware that cadre members had the ear of the principal at the three-hour weekly cadre sessions. The integration of cadre and faculty was an area that needed special attention.

These disadvantages of placement were offset by cadre efforts to develop a program that specifically brought additional curriculum resources to the entire school and to individual teachers at all grade levels. University-based teachers were officially half-time, but the school benefited from their high level of commitment and extra hours spent at the school. The weekly cadre meetings were open to all faculty members. The greatest personal help to me was having a group in the faculty which understood my role thoroughly and were actively supporting and positively interpreting my actions. The cadre kept avenues of communication open in all departments of the school. This does not mean that we were without our moments of misinterpretations and misunderstandings. In a large urban school communication with faculty is difficult, and I found the insights of the cadre helpful in this important area. Faculty members also used the cadre to bring items of concern to my attention at the weekly cadre meetings.

It is at this point that I would like to mention an unanticipated professional and personal benefit to me accruing from the cadre placement. Normally, the principalship is a lonely job, even though invaluable assistance and practical know-how is given by my assistant principal. There are still those times when I sit down at a table for coffee with faculty members and small talk stops, gossip ends, and skuttlebutt ceases. I leave knowing little more than before. Or, I can ask specifically for criticism or feed-back on some new procedure or program, and very little is received. The principal must

be careful of sharing confidences, developing close faculty friends, or using certain teachers for favorable tasks.

Through the cadre program, I have close at hand two additional sources of administrative colleagueship. The University Liaison and the Social Services Supervisor have been invaluable in giving me constructive criticism, serving as sounding boards for ideas, and, yes, coming through with those faint words of praise we all need. Their knowledge of the field of administration, their university-research orientation, and their semi-detached perspectives have often enabled me to step back, observe myself, and make more rational decisions. Indirectly Horace Mann benefits, but most directly I have profited by the interactions of our roles.

The fourth aspect of the program, the establishment of demonstration and induction schools has not been carried out to the extent of the Getzels proposal. Of course, the cadre itself can be considered a demonstration program. As effectiveness and efficiency are increased and faculty stability is strengthened, the ties between school district, school, and university could be used to coordinate research in methods, curriculum development, and evaluative procedures. I think that the Ford Training and Placement Program has demonstrated that the university has a role to play in urban education and in the translation of theory into practice.

I have many suggestions for additions and corrections for the Ford Training and Placement Program, but that is for another paper. One difference noted in studies between suburban schools and inner-

city schools is the higher level of frustration on the part of the urban principal--frustration in being unable to channel or even reach resources in solving problems, in obtaining materials when needed, in utilizing university know-how, and in building stability and flexibility into the structure of the school. The Ford Training and Placement Program has made great inroads for alleviating this frustration. Its help has been many-faceted, immediate and most meaningful. A tired, harried, but less frustrated principal is grateful.

Notes

1. J. W. Getzels, "Education for the Inner City: A Practical Proposal by an Impractical Theorist," The School Review, Vol. 75, No. 3 (Autumn, 1967), p. 287.

2. Ibid., pp. 288-95.

3. Francis S. Chase, "How to Meet Teachers' Expectations of Leadership," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 1, No. 9 (April, 1953), p. 1.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL AS A SETTING FOR FIELD WORK INSTRUCTION IN SOCIAL WORK: A COORDINATED PROGRAM WITH TEACHER TRAINING

Carol Thackham

Field Instruction

Field instruction is an important part of the curriculum of a professional school of social work. Its purpose is to give the graduate social work student a guided experience through which he learns how to apply the professional knowledge, that he has acquired from previous experience and from his classroom courses, to develop professional attitudes and philosophy. Field instruction is designed to give the student opportunity to integrate theory through its use in practice and to translate his knowledge into use in working with his clients and with the community.

The term 'guided experience' means that the student works closely with a field instructor. The relationship with the instructor is a vital part of the student's field learning experience. It involves teaching and learning processes consciously shared by the instructor and the student. Self-activity on the part of the learner in the process is stressed. This means that the student gains most as he participates fully in improving his understanding and skills, in offering his own ideas, feelings, and questions for study and evaluation, and in being willing to use himself and his new learning. While the lecture and discussion

method of classroom work is similar to other educational experience the student has had, it should be recognized that the tutorial instruction in the field represents a new educational method to most students. The instructor/student relationship also differs qualitatively from supervisor/worker relationships which the student may have experienced in past job situations.

The field instruction program is a collaborative effort in social work education undertaken by a community agency and a professional school of social work. To discharge its educational function, the agency makes available its accumulated knowledge and skill arising from its own experience and practice and gives students appropriate access, under guidance of the field instructor and for educational purposes, to the range of its administrative and direct service operations and activities.

The Field Instructor

The field instructor serves as an agency-based teacher offering tutorial instruction to the student. In discharging this function the field instructor carries a five-fold responsibility for: (1) the design of the learning experiences; (2) the development of an educational assessment and evaluation of assigned students; (3) the fashioning of each student's field work assignments; (4) the continued tutorial instruction; and (5) safeguarding the quality of the services provided by the agency.

The Agency

Using the public schools as an agency for field work instruction in social work education is not new. The innovation here is that the social work students were placed in the same school with students from education under the auspices of the Ford Training and Placement Program. They worked closely together in the summer of 1969 learning the different role that each fulfills in functioning in the public school setting.

Preparations for the entrance of the social work students into the public schools is probably one of the most important aspects. It is this initial understanding and commitment between the school principal and university field instructor which becomes the foundation for working through problems which are encountered later as school personnel and social work students begin to try to function together.

Before our students and intern teachers entered the school, several meetings were held with the principal and assistant principal. The nature of the field work experience was discussed. It was emphasized that it is to be regarded primarily as a learning opportunity for the social work student. However, service to the school takes on more significance as the student learns and gains skills in his role. Printed material about social work was also made available.

During these discussions the field instructor tried to gain as much knowledge as possible about the school and its community. This included the number of faculty, length of time in the school,

number of children, socio-economic level of the community, parent leaders, special problems, etc.

The follwing guidelines were set down as the basic structure for the operation of the social work program in the school.

1. Problems considered appropriate for referral to the social worker are generally problems of neglect or abuse, and general problems of social and/or emotional maladaptation and behavior problems that make it difficult for the school and child to continue to function together.
2. Referrals may come from several sources--classroom teacher, special teacher, parent, social agency, etc.
3. All referrals are channeled through building principal and/or guidance or adjustment personnel. This is done through a screening conference with the field work instructor, student, social worker, and appropriate school personnel.
4. Acceptance of the case is based on a mutual discussion in terms of service to the pupil and school and the learning value to the student social workers.
5. As soon as possible after accepting the case, the student social worker informs school personnel of impressions, observations, general evaluation, and some tentative treatment plans, e.g. direct work with child or parent, agency contact, etc.
6. The student social worker gives continued service with frequent contacts with school personnel to enhance coordinate efforts and joint planning.

7. Casework supervision of case planning, etc., is provided by the field work instructor through weekly conferences with the student social worker.
8. This is supplemented as needed and when appropriate by contacts (formal and informal) with school personnel who have specialized knowledge of school policies and procedures, referral resources, and specific knowledge or information on cases.

These procedures are initially seen as being reasonable, logical, clear, concise, and generally acceptable. However, as an attempt is made to follow through in practice they frequently begin to be seen as a hindrance, bothersome, time-consuming, and to be avoided if at all possible. Teachers begin to want direct access to the social workers without involving the principal. The principal makes referrals without bothering to inform the classroom teacher. It is at the point that the student social worker frequently becomes anxious and concerned and somewhat apprehensive that "it doesn't work." The field instructor can step in, relate back to the initial agreement and insist that the procedures be followed.

The guidelines have been deliberately developed in such a way that participation of several people in the school setting is built-in from the beginning. Frequently, this is a new experience for those involved. It means actually sitting down together to discuss a problem and making some attempt to find a solution. It is a face-to-face public commitment to working toward a solution of a problem rather than just complaining or sending it off to someone else to solve.

This process of referral in and of itself can become part of the solution of problems. It is an opportunity for reflection and planning before any action takes place. It is an opportunity for consideration of alternatives and consequences. It is an opportunity for principal, teacher, and social worker to learn something of the others' difficulties with problems and the responsibilities that each has in finding a solution.

The conference then becomes the first demonstration of one of the basic tools of the social work contribution. It brings people together, in a somewhat structured way, to (1) define a mutual problem, (2) discuss possible solutions of the problem, (3) and to publicly commit themselves to a course of action toward a solution.

This continues to be a major part of the activity of the social workers even as they move into seeing clients individually. There is a consistent effort to bring people together to discuss the problems with which they feel confronted. The general goal is to develop collaborative relationships among personnel rather than an attitude of assigning responsibility to others. This is an essential component of any planned change, and is a very complex series of expectations and encounters with all those involved in a given situation. Collaboration is an achievement,not a given condition. The ways of effective collaboration must be learned and opportunities for this learning must be provided.

Day-to-Day Functioning of the Student Social Worker. From the viewpoint of the student social worker in the public schools, many problems arise rather quickly. The initial phase is usually quite

pleasant and positive. He is made to feel welcome. The principal genuinely comments on the deep appreciation of the help to be offered by the social worker. There is some excitement and pleasurable anticipation on the part of the student in looking forward to this new experience. Everyone is friendly and he has a certain confidence in his ability to relate to people and to work with them. No demands are being made on either side and it is easy to feel that there will be no problems. When they do come, the student is unprepared and the desire to give up and leave the situation becomes very strong. Even the demonstration that the conference is workable and the success in this area does not fully support the student for later encounters of resistance and other difficulties.

The public school is a secondary setting for the practice of social work. This becomes one of the most difficult lessons for the student to learn. It is discussed at length in student unit meetings; the philosophy and theory are well learned but the experience of learning it in practice can be close to devastating without constant support, interpretation, and discussion with the field instructor.

The realization that the public school is not a social work agency comes very slowly and frequently rather painfully. As the school session begins, the teachers go to their classrooms. There is structure, content, and a place for them. The student social worker begins to see and feel that there is no place for him. This

can be only figuratively or quite literally so. Schools are very crowded; social work classes are held in crowded corners, lunchrooms, half-rooms, and hallways. The student social worker competes for space and finds that the regular school program usually takes priority. Problems other than physical space also begin to appear. A private phone (seen as a necessity in any self-respecting social work agency) is an unheard of luxury in a public school. Secretarial help for case recording and correspondence is virtually non-existent. All schedules and routines are geared to the classroom and teaching. The principal and teachers are unavailable and involved in "other" things.

Comments from the student social workers are now apt to be that they are not wanted; the school wants them to do work that is not social work; the school in general and some teachers in particular do not know anything about the needs and rights of children; they are punitive, they do not understand, they will not cooperate, they are hostile, and do not trust us. Obviously, many of these feelings are reactive and projected as the social work student is beginning to learn that the public schools have been established primarily for something other than providing social work services. This realization comes cautiously and with many feelings, first of rejection and anger, then of compromise. Then, hopefully, the collaborative relationship emerges. The real acceptance of differences and a growing respect for colleague professionals becomes a maturing experience forming an even more enduring foundation for working on problems together.

During this time the cadre is especially helpful and supportive. It gives one a place where the student social worker really "belongs." He has full membership with others and is able to share equally in the many discussions of all aspects of the life of the school and community. It is in this arena that he can hear comments similar to his own. He hears teachers and administrators question what they are doing and where they are really going. Here he can experience first-hand the attempts others make to function adequately in a difficult situation. Their feelings and reactions to success or failure are also observable and frequently verbalized. The cadre becomes a sustaining experience that also evolves into a consciously used resource.

THE CADRE LIAISON/CURRICULUM COORDINATOR ROLE

Geraldine Brownlee

The operationalization of the Getzel's proposal is necessarily a complex process, as it adds numerous atypical dimensions and new levels of interaction in the training of school personnel. One readily and constantly arrives at this realization when one is performing as the cadre liaison/curriculum-coordinator with the elementary school administrators, teachers, social workers, parents, interested community, and with Ford staff and university faculty. It is from this unique role and vantage ground, in a condensed way, that I will: (1) share several considerations that tended to structure an approach to the task; (2) denote some positive outputs to date; and (3) indicate several issues that have been raised.

Initially, the problem is how does one assist the elementary school component to meet the dynamic educational needs in a particular, difficult, predominantly black urban school? In brief, the training program began with somewhat comprehensive sessions of focused preparation of school personnel: teachers, adult educator, social workers and administrators. The objectives were to: (1) improve professional skills; (2) learn more about the black learner; and (3) become more knowledgeable about the black learner's milieu. Time was alloted for coordinated preparation and group or cadre formation under the leadership of the cadre liaison/curriculum coordinator to plan innovative curriculums, to become conversant with common

school problems and to learn to understand each role and the expectations of various school personnel, parents, and the broader community.

However, the role seemed to need a framework of its own to guide its function. The following queries are examples of some of the considerations that directed the search for answers. What is curriculum? Which traditional ways of viewing curriculum can bring about some resolution of the above problem? What different ways of viewing curriculum must be explored? What are the role expectations of each protagonist? What are the priorities?

Summarily, it was decided that curriculum was not to be viewed in any way in the parochial sense. Rather, it seemed more compatible to the program's goals and to the cadre's activities to define curriculum in institutional terms as suggested by Francis Chase.[1] The cadre liaison/curriculum-coordinator role afforded the opportunity to translate the institutional concept through persistent interpretations and sensitiveness to the group as well as responsiveness from the group. Subsequently, there has been an apparent growing realization that the goal of meeting the needs of a particular urban school community can be realized by affecting change in the behavior of all actors and through a concrete understanding of how regulations and rules may be orchestrated, manipulated, and reciprocated systematically.

Another consideration that was a direct input in structuring the cadre liaison/curriculum coordinator role was the unusually high level of professional support from the program director, school

administrator, and the social work field instructor. This may have been an outgrowth of public school, university and academic experiences which were common to all.

Some positive outcomes have been to: (1) observe faculty, parents, and Ford staff working together on school-wide concerns; (2) learn to utilize the invaluable contribution of the parent in the cadre; (3) use university faculty and program staff as meaningful, timely resources; (4) have supplementary material and financial resources available when needed; (5) watch developing competence and leadership in the inexperienced personnel in the program; (6) feel some increasing group spirit, support, and trust; (7) observe growth in understanding all roles; (3) experience some significant signs of increased commitment to the school community; (10) witness some changes in school administrative styles; (11) afford the opportunity to experiment with school organization which involves new deployment of teachers, parents, and students.

Finally, some observations from this position may raise some basic program issues. For example, in one's training for a problem school setting, should one move in a continuum from the area of individual role competence, then cross-role competence to more broad urban problems, or from the broader problem to the more specific; or should there be mediation from one area to the other (between the macro and the micro) in a responsive manner to be determined by the episodes? Also, does the university, through implicit expectations, prepare an elitist group for cadre formation and

placement? If so, how can the cadre's influence pervade the school-community from this select position? Lastly, does the program intervention in the school tend to raise the aspirational goals of other school-based personnel so that a higher than average number in the latter group, in turn, may leave the school for further professional training, thereby creating a more unstable faculty? While on the other hand, will the school personnel trained in a high status university tend to change professional goals more quickly and move into higher status roles elsewhere?

Notes

1. Francis S. Chase, Lecture delivered for Education 367: Problems in Curriculum, University of Chicago, May 8, 1968.

THE CONCLUSION

For many of the experienced teachers participating in the Ford Training and Placement Program, we find this program to be a step in alleviating some of the problems in the schools. We are very conscious of the needs of our children--both black and white. However, we do feel that the educational gaps apparent in black children are also present in other ethnic groups. All children need security, support, skills to operate in our society, knowledge of themselves, and steps toward critically evaluating the world around them. It is unfortunate that for so long educational theoreticians have neglected the needs of minority children and, therefore, a gap has developed in the growth of all children.

The Ford Training and Placement Program is not a panacea for either the educational ills or societal ills. It attempts to focus on one problem, the building of competent professionals in the urban educational system. Admittedly, we must deal with many of the current problems facing the schools and society, but only as they directly affect us.

We further admit that this program has several problems often due to organizational complexities. How does one get others meaningfully involved in perceiving themselves and school problems? How does one or a group initiate meaningful dialogue? Can a group as small as a cadre hope to effect any kind of educational change in a school? What steps are necessary for preparation for teaching in a particular school? Can a school-based group really involve the administration, community, and students on a non-threatening basis? What kinds of

inputs can I make to the experiences of a new teacher that would alleviate some of the initial problems? What level of involvement must I have in order to foster reciprocal learning between the teacher trainee and the experienced teacher? These and many other questions must be dealt with by the experienced teacher component of a cadre.

If we can accept the viewpoint of an experienced teacher, then the Ford program may conclude that in small measure the program is successful; not overwhelmingly successful but modestly successful in its activities in the school system. We have had only five distinct experiences in the Chicago school system; how can we be more than circumspect in disseminating our conclusions?

We agree with the contributing writers to the "Resource Papers" who say that the Ford program is not a panacea, but maybe it has made some adequate diagnoses and has suggested some remedies. Neither the preceding documents nor the Ford program would say that we have the answer. We only hope to search for more sensitive responses to some of the questions raised in the "Resource Papers."

The final contribution to these documents is a discussion of the Ford program's philosophy for undergraduate training of educational professionals. We would like to introduce one way by which the project could be useful to other institutions, specifically undergraduate schools. The Ford program realizes that many more teachers enter the teaching profession with a bachelor's degree than a master's degree; therefore, we must consider the exportability of this program to trainees at the bachelor's level.

John Sawyer: "The Ford Training and Placement Philosophy As the Basis for an Alternative Program to Train Teachers at the Undergraduate Level"

Mr. John Sawyer, cadre liaison for the Forrestville cadre, has synthesized several of his beliefs concerning undergraduate educational training and the philosophy of the Ford program.

THE FORD TRAINING AND PLACEMENT PHILOSOPHY AS THE BASIS FOR AN ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM TO TRAIN TEACHERS AT THE UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL

John Sawyer

Over the years institutions of higher learning have trained teachers in more or less the same way. In most cases this has meant hours of course work followed by a short period of student teaching. The purpose of this paper is to examine an alternative method for the training of teachers. The area specifically alluded to is the student teaching experience. The paper is in three parts. We shall describe training programs as they exist, develop a rationale for change, and use the Ford Training and Placement Program philosophy to introduce an alternative model for training teachers.

Present Training Programs

While graduate degrees are desirable for every teacher, probably more than 90% of all new teachers enter schools with the minimum degree required by state certification agencies. The standard training procedure for new teachers involves course work in many subject areas followed by an observation and student teaching experience. In most cases the student teaching experience is co-supervised by an instructor from the university and a member of the faculty of the school. Normally teacher training institutions meet only part of the trainee's needs by assigning him an experienced teacher, a university based coordinator, and a seminar before or during the student teaching

experience. A major weakness of this approach is its failure to formalize and systemize the various inputs to make them most beneficial to the trainee. Generally the cooperating teacher and the university-based coordinator will interact only three or four times during the semester of student teaching. Cooperating teachers view the student teacher as one who provides relief from part of the regular teacher's program. Often the student teacher is left alone with the classes after the first week or two. In the seminar the coordinator is the only one able to draw on a reservoir of experience. Even in this case it is often the voice of experience long removed from the practical setting of the classroom.

Rationale for Change

Perhaps it is time to recognize that the universal teacher for all places is a myth. Training institutions in seeking to produce the universal teacher only increases the frustration level of the graduate when he enters the field and discovers that he has not been prepared for the specific role in which he must now function. Much of the literature on the climate of schools suggest that one should view the school as a social system.[1] The successful introduction of a new member to the system is enhanced when the inductee has been given the opportunity to understand the relationships that exist and how they function. To train teachers for central city schools and white suburban schools as if the teaching situations were interchangeable ignores the inherent differences between teaching in one situation as opposed to the other.[2] Adapting the inputs in training programs

to meet the needs of the diverse schools in which trainees will eventually work should be the responsibility of teacher training institutions.

The Ford Training and Placement Program as an Alternative

The Ford Training and Placement Program sees its alternative for training prospective teachers as a two-pa.e process. Initially the future teacher needs theory and training more closely related to the particular type of school in which he expects to function. It is assumed that every teacher training institution has data on where its graduates are most likely to teach. These data can serve as the basis for designing programs. The introduction of courses which examine theoretical and practical problems related to teaching in schools identified as inner city, outer city, or suburban are necessary. This suggests that individuals operating in the type of schools where the trainee will eventually teach might serve as an instructor or consultant for such courses. The training institution might also wish to bring students from elementary secondary school to the university to participate in training prospective teachers. Mere exposure to students gives the trainee a more realistic sense of student needs. The specifics of such courses must be worked out by the institutions with the assistance of trainees, school personnel, and students.

Phase two of the Ford philosophy is designed to maximize benefit from the training program when the trainee is placed in a school. Getzels' analysis is as follows:

> The conception of the school as a social system suggests that the greater the mutual understanding and acceptance among the various educational personnel, the more likely the effectiveness and efficiency of the school. Yet current placement procedures persist in assigning teachers, counselors, and principals individually rather than as groups, and often without opportunity to get to know one another prior to the first week and sometimes not until the first day of actual performance. It is as if the various individuals who were expected to form a team--say a football team, if I may use this analogy at a University of Chicago meeting--were trained separately by position and were brought together for the first time only on the day of the first game.[3]

The formation of a group composed of trainees, experienced teachers, administrators, and role specialists provides trainees with support from a variety of sources. Interaction among members is a valuable way for all to develop a common basis on which to launch programs to improve instruction. In this way trainees are provided with supports within the social system of the school. Ordinarily the trainees introduction to the school is left to happenstance. Many of the values he develops as a new teacher are influenced by one or two faculty members. The idea of a cadre composed of members with various roles within the school increases the chances of a trainee assimilating a variety of viewpoints. This way there would be opportunity for the trainee to develop his potential as a teacher relatively free from the biased influence of disillusioned staff members.

Operating throughout the Ford Training and Placement Program's philosophy is the fusion of the university, the school, and the community it serves into one unit committed to the development of effective programs for training teachers. The undergraduate trainee becomes more effective because his introduction is as a member of a team rather than as an isolated individual. The experienced teachers and administrators benefit from the exchanges with new trainees. It would seem

appropriate for the training institution to open its graduate programs to experienced teachers for retraining. The university benefits from the development of more effective training programs. The greatest benefit accrues to the students and the community. This should be the case in any program designed to serve the needs of students. Numerous problems must be worked out at the local level. What is suggested here is that teacher training institutions can best train future teachers by using their resources in conjunction with the resources available in the arena where the trainee will perform.

Cadre composition. If one were to identify all of the unique characteristics of different schools it is possible that the need for over fifty specific training programs could emerge. Our purpose here is to describe a model based on our theoretical notion of group training which is flexible enough to be adapted to widely different needs. The training group should include representatives of the following interests:

1. Trainees from teacher training institutions. Trainees may represent a variety of subject areas or they may represent a variety of grade levels. In other cases trainees may all be subject matter specialists from one discipline.
2. Experienced personnel from the school system. School based personnel should match the trainees. For example if there is a trainee in eighth grade social studies the group should also include an experienced eighth grade social studies teacher. At the same time experienced teachers who are

members of departments and areas not represented by trainees might also be included.

3. Role specialists from the school system. Included here are administrators, counselors and other similar non-classroom positions in the school.
4. Role specialists from teacher training institutions. Co-ordinators of various subject areas and individuals specifically capable of providing alternative methods of instruction to the group will be invaluable.
5. Representatives of the community. Positive support from parents and community organizations is necessary. It will probably be necessary to work out a system for community participation which insures the inclusion of the various groups which have different viewpoints when such differences exist within a community.
6. Student representation. This is more desirable if the group is training teachers for the upper grades. Students' inputs present a different perception of the learning experience.
7. A liaison person between the school, community and training institution is necessary to facilitate the exchange of ideas and resources. He must be free to serve all group members equally. Ideally he will spend a great deal of his time in the school since the group will function there.
8. A process consultant is also needed. In the group's formal meetings and during informal sub-group discussions his role may deal with issue clarification. His primary task relates

to keeping group members tuned into the issues they are dealing with without forcing structure in the group's discussions.

How the group should function. In that our model is primarily one for training new teachers, it is expected that the primary responsibility for leadership will rest with the training institution. What must be emphasized is that cooperative leadership from the training institution, the school system, and the community increases the program's chances of success. The training institution and the school system must agree to place trainees in a school where the opportunity to train is available. Community leaders must share the responsibility for the program. Altogether the three groups must determine what pre-training is necessary before beginning the school year. It is possible that the group might desire to use the summer for a variety of experiences from formal course work to planning instructional programs for the Fall.

After school begins a seminar-type experience should be scheduled on a regular basis. Such meetings must be scheduled for evenings or on weekends. Compensation for group members may be monetary or academic credit. Attendance at meetings is the responsibility of all group members. There should be little limitation on the content range for the meetings. As the group develops it may become necessary to develop an agenda for meetings. However, unless the group sees the need for an agenda, structure should be loose. Issues and programs important to group members will determine the group's direction.

Trainees should share the responsibility for teaching classes with experienced teachers. They should share non-classroom responsibilities with experienced personnel in order to become more familiar with the

non-teaching roles and the interaction between different roles in the total school's social system. Feedback on their performance in the classroom and in non-classroom situations must be given. Ideally the group experience should facilitate feedback from other group members being viewed as non-threatening.

Experienced teachers also need feedback. The use of electronic equipment to tape class sessions may prove valuable. University-based personnel and trainees may bring new materials and methodology to the experienced teacher. A reasonable expectation for experienced teachers participating in the training program should be improvement in their own instruction as well as imparting knowledge to trainees.

Administrators and other role specialists at the school benefit from the projected harmonious relationship with teachers. It is assumed that this harmony will emerge because the group training experience provides each component with knowledge of the others function. It is probably true that teachers wih experience as administrators are more understanding of administrative problems than teachers without such experience.

Role specialists from the training institution may provide valuable assistance to the school-based component by facilitating the availability of the training institutions resources. Their knowledge of new theories, techniques, and materials may prove especially valuable to the experienced teachers.

Since they are affected more than anyone else by a particular decision related to their schools, it is vital that community groups be given power to influence such decisions. Placing the local community's power behind a school willing to address the communities'

problems may produce relevant programs with measurable increment of improved instruction. When teacher training institutions, long considered unconcerned with the problems of urban schools, unite with community and school system leaders, change becomes probable.

Student participation in any group whose goal is to train teachers more realistically is important. Students are more aware of the deficiencies in instruction programs than anyone outside the classroom. Their inputs can help design a program to provide the kinds of experiences needed to improve instruction. They should be encouraged to speak out on the issues as they see them.

Expected outcomes of the program. At the end of the training year those members of the group who were trainees should be placed in full time teaching positions in the school at which they have trained. In this way new teachers committed to the school and its programs are available. The assumption that one with knowledge of the particular situation can perform more effectively can be tested in this way. For the school in the central city the development of teachers committed to their programs would be a step forward, because too often their schools have served as ports of entry and way-stations for teachers on their way to other "more desirable" schools.

The training group must recognize the experimental nature of the program. Inherent in an experimental program is the right to fail. The analysis of information relative to the group's performance might provide indicators of approaches and techniques that are successful. In this way refinements in the group's style may be introduced. Subsequently, these refinements may be tested. Ultimately the goal is to

produce teachers equipped, through theory and practice, to operate effectively in the type of school for which they were trained. To become more specific in training for particular types of school is no less rational than to train specifically for different subject areas and grade levels. This type of specialized personnel is needed--especially in the central city.

Notes

1. J. W. Getzels, "Education for the Inner City: A Practical Proposal by an Impractical Theorist," The School Review, Vol. 75, No. 3 (Autumn, 1967).

2. Ibid., p. 287.

3. Ibid.